This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

308
S514

Senator of the United States

THE

WORKS

OF

WILLIAM H. SEWARD

EDITED BY

GEORGE E. BAKER

"Nature and Laws would be in an ill case, if Slavery should find what to say for itself, and Liberty be mute; and if tyrants should find men to plead for them, and they that can waste and vanquish tyrants, should not be able to find advocates." MILTON.

IN FIVE VOLUMES

VOL. IV.

NEW EDITION

BOSTON
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
New York: 11 East Seventeenth Street
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
1888

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1861,
BY GEO. E. BAKER,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States in and for the
Northern District of New York.

371259

PREFACE TO VOLUME IV.

THE fourth volume of THE WORKS OF WILLIAM H. SEWARD, is now presented to the public.

The three preceding volumes, beginning with the earliest events of his life, closed with the enactment of the compromises of 1850.

The present volume includes the succeeding and eventful period made memorable by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the struggle of slavery for Kansas, the assault upon a senator in the senate chamber by a slaveholding representative of South Carolina, the organization of the Republican party, its almost successful contest in 1856, and its triumph in the presidential election of 1860, and by the admission of Kansas into the Union a Free State:—a period that may be said to comprise the harvest season of those principles which in previous years Mr. Seward had sown in the public mind, and watched and cultivated with so much consistency and integrity of purpose.

The Memoir begun in the first volume is continued in the following pages, down to the inauguration of a Republican administration. It aims only to give a plain history of the times and events of which Mr. Seward is so important a part. The action of Congress and the movements of political parties during the ten years—especially such as find illustration and comment in his speeches—are quite fully recorded. His interesting tour through the Western states during the last presidential campaign, including all the brief but eloquent

speeches which he made at various places in response to the addresses presented to him, forms a considerable portion of the Memoir. These impromptu speeches contain many beautiful passages and are full of Mr. Seward's peculiar sentiments.

The ORATIONS and ADDRESSES, following the Memoir, are among the most valuable productions of their author's fertile mind. They are entitled, The Destiny of America; The True Basis of American Independence; The Physical, Moral and Intellectual Development of the American People; and The Pilgrims and Liberty.

A BIOGRAPHY OF DE WITT CLINTON, occupies the next twenty pages of the volume. This is an original paper,[1] prepared with that just appreciation of its subject which Mr. Seward is known to entertain. It gives more clearly than any biography, yet written, of that illustrious man, the political springs which moved his public life.

POLITICAL SPEECHES, is the title of the next division of the volume. The limits of a Preface will allow but a passing allusion to any of the contents of the volume. We can only, therefore, call attention to these speeches—some twenty in number, beginning with the advent of the Republican party, in 1854, and extending through the campaigns of 1856, 1858 and 1860—as containing the history and philosophy of the great party which now governs the country.

The SPEECHES IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, embraced in this volume, present an eloquent and vivid history of the Kansas struggle from its inception in 1854, when Mr. Douglas introduced the bill to organize the territory, to the final success of Freedom in 1861, when the Senate by a decisive vote admitted the new state into the Union.

Mr. Seward's latest speeches, on THE STATE OF THE UNION, conclude the volume.

His speeches in the Senate, with those before the people in their primary assemblies, make a text book from which the richest instruc-

[1] A portion of it appears also in the New American Cyclopedia.

tions may be drawn in the new Era upon which our country is just entering.

Perhaps the criticism that in some quarters greeted the earlier volumes may salute this—that herein is Mr. Seward proven to be an Agitator. But History vindicates the agitator, from Paul to Luther and from Luther to the century of Romilly, Wilberforce and Jefferson. That Mr. Seward has been an Agitator to no purpose will hardly, now, be contended, if the to-day at Washington be contrasted with the morning when the Atherton resolutions were introduced into the House, or with the hour when Mr. Seward, almost alone, confronted an unbroken column of pro-slavery senators.

Nevertheless, as Mr. Seward himself has said, the verdict is not to be looked for in the passing hour. "There is Yet in that word Hereafter."

Neither, is this the place for vindication or eulogy, if any were needed. The four volumes speak for themselves.

In those before published, appear Mr. Seward's Orations and Discourses; his Occasional Addresses and Speeches; his Notes on New York and Executive Messages; his Forensic Arguments and Political Writings; his Correspondence with the Virginia and Georgia Governors, and his Letters from Europe in 1833; his Speeches in the Senate of New York, and in the Senate of the United States.

The friendly zeal which has prepared these volumes, may have given place or prominence to some sentiments and speeches which a timid policy would have suppressed. In similar collections an *Index Expurgatorius*, it is charged, has been allowed to swallow up the living issues of the day.

But the Works of William H. Seward could not escape an injunction writ from their primary author, unless the boldness and frankness of his thoughts had faithfully manipulated the types.

Mr. Seward's sentences are all so full of the inspiration of Liberty and Justice, and so like aphorisms, that it is difficult to abbreviate

or to suppress a page without loss to the public or injustice to the author's fame. Therefore, what at first may appear to be an editor's purpose to swell the size of the volume, will, on a closer view, be found a necessity.[1]

In the State Library at Albany, within the past year, has been erected the marble bust of the Ex-Governor and Senator of New York. It is midway between the alcove of History and Philosophy, and its gaze is directed at that immense compilation of brain labor—the Edinburgh Review. A lady visitor, who was stranger to the place and face, pausing before it said, "Here beams in expression, thought, benevolence, earnestness and devotion to principle."

When the partisan rancor and political schisms of to-day shall have subsided, when prejudice shall have given place to candor, the Muse of History, we believe, will say the same of these volumes, and of those which time may add.

THE EDITOR.

March 4, 1861.

[1] Another volume like the present will be required for the speeches yet remaining in the editor's hands, unpublished. Several important speeches intended for this volume, and to which references are made in the Memoir, are unavoidably crowded out. An APPENDIX to the present volume contains the eloquent speeches made at the Chicago Convention; the Platform; and also the addresses of welcome presented to Mr. Seward on his visit to the Western States.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV.

MEMOIR, BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL,..... 13

A Retrospect, 13—The Struggle for Freedom in 1850, 15—Mr. Seward's Course, 16—Death of President Taylor, 19—The Compromisers Triumphant, 20—Nominations of General Scott and Frank Pierce, 21—Defeat of the Whigs and Supposed Overthrow of Mr. Seward, 22—Oration at Columbus, and Address before the American Institute, 23—The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, 24—Mr. Seward's Speeches, 27—The New England Clergymen, 29—The Pacific Railroad and the Homestead Law, 31—The Fugitive Slave Act, 32—Mr. Seward's Reëlection, 33—The Plymouth Oration, 36—Aggressive Acts of Slavery, 36—Kansas Affairs, 37—The Assault on Charles Sumner, 40—Organization of the Republican Party, 41—Presidential Election of 1856, 43—Fulfillment of Mr. Seward's Prophecy, 44—The Atlantic Telegraph, 45—The Tariff Assailed, 46—The Dred Scott Decision, 47—Reconstruction of the Supreme Court, 49—Duties on Railroad Iron, 50—The Lecompton Matter, 50—The English Bill, 53—Oregon and Minnesota, 54—Mormons and Fillibusters, 55—The Elections of 1858, 56—Mr. Seward's Irrepressible Conflict Speech, 56—Cuba, Kansas and the Pacific Railroad, 57—The Homestead Bill, 58—The Indiana Senators, 60—Acquisition of Cuba, 61—Overland Mails, 61—Mr. Seward Visits Europe and the Holy Land—Departure and Return, 63—Captain John Brown takes Harper's Ferry, 68—The Elections of 1859, 69—Death of Broderick, 70—Election of Speaker—The Impending Crisis, 70—Mr. Seward's Great Speech in the Senate, February 29, 1860, 71—The Spring Elections of 1860, favorable, 73—Presidental Nominations and Platforms, 74—The Republican Convention at Chicago, 76—The Ballot, 77—Mr. Seward's Cordial Approval of the Candidates and Platform, 78—His Visit to New England, Reception Speeches, 81—Enters the Canvass for Mr. Lincoln, 84—Remarkable Tour and Speeches through the West—DETROIT, 84—LANSING, 85—KALAMAZOO, 89—MADISON, 90—LA CROSSE, 93—ST. PAUL, 94—DUBUQUE, 96—In Missouri—CHILLICOTHE, 97—ST. JOSEPH, 98—In Kansas—LEAVENWORTH, 100—LAWRENCE, 101—LEAVENWORTH, 102—ATCHISON, 103—In Missouri, again—ST. LOUIS, 106—In Illinois—SPRINGFIELD, Abraham Lincoln, 107—CHICAGO, 108—CLEVELAND, Ohio, 110—BUFFALO, 111—AUBURN, 113—End of Campaign, 113—Result, 114—Celebration of Victory, 115—Admission of Kansas—Secretary of State—Speeches on Secession and the State of the Union, 117.

ORATIONS AND ADDRESSES,..... 119

Oration at Columbus, Ohio, September 14, 1853—The Destiny of America, 121.

Address before the American Institute, New York, October 20, 1853—The True Basis of American Independence, 144.

Address before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Yale College, New Haven, July 26, 1854--The Physical, Moral and Intellectual Development of the American People, 160.

Oration on Forefathers' Day, at Plymouth, Massachusetts, December 21, 1855—The Pilgrims and Liberty, 179—Speech at the Dinner, 203.

BIOGRAPHY OF DE WITT CLINTON,..... 206

Birth and Parentage—George Clinton—Political Relations—The Council of Appointment, 209—John Jay—Party Spirit—Slavery—Mayor of New York, 211—Hamilton, Burr, Lewis and Tompkins—Candidate for President, 213—Projects the Canal, 216—A Private Citizen in Adversity—Elected Governor, 219—His Administration—Death.

POLITICAL SPEECHES,..... 223

The Advent of the Republican Party: The Privileged Class, *Albany*, October 12, 1855, 225—The Contest and the Crisis, *Buffalo*, October 19, 1855, 241—The Dominant Class in the Republic, *Detroit*, October 2, 1856, 253—The Political Parties of the Day, *Auburn*, October 21, 1856, 276—The Irrepressible Conflict, *Rochester*, October 25, 1858, 289—The National Divergence and Return, *Detroit*, September 4, 1860, 303—Democracy the Chief Element of Government, *Madison*, September 12, 1860, 319—The Constitution Interpreted—an Extract—*Madison*, September 11, 1860, 329—Political Equality the National Idea, *St. Paul*, September, 1860, 330—The National Idea; Its Perils and Triumphs, *Chicago*, October 3, 1860, 348—The Republican Policy and the one Idea, *Dubuque*, September 21, 1860, 368—Young Men and the Future—an Extract—*Cleveland*, October 4, 1860, 384—Kansas the Savior of Freedom, *Lawrence*, September 26, 1860, 385—The Policy of the Fathers of the Republic, *Seneca Falls*, October 31, 1860, 397—Trade in Slaves—an Extract—*La Crosse*, September 14, 1860, 409—The Republican Party and Secession, *New York*, November 2, 1860, 410—Disunion and Secession—Extract—*La Crosse*, September 14, 1860, 421—The Night before the Election, *Auburn*, November 5, 1860, 422—The Past and the Future—Extract—*Cleveland*, October 4, 1860, 430.

SPEECHES IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,..... 431

Nebraska and Kansas—Freedom and Public Faith—Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, February 17, 1854, 433. *Second Speech*, the night of the final passage of the Nebraska-Kansas Bill, May 25, 1854, 464. *The Immediate Admission of Kansas*—Emigrant Aid Societies—Elections and Laws—Impeachment of the President—Compromises and Disunion, April 9, 1856, 479. *Kansas Usurpations*—Speech against Mr. Douglas's second Enabling Bill and in Favor of the Immediate

Admission of Kansas into the Union—Slavery and Compromises, July 2, 1856, 512. *Kansas and the Army*—The Spurious Laws—Barbarous Enactments—Usurpations, August 7, 1856, 535. *The same*, at the Extraordinary Session—Compromises and Popular Sovereignty, August 27, 1856, 559. *Lecompton and Kansas*—The Lecompton Constitution—The Dred Scott Decision and the President—The Kansas Governors—The Supreme Court, March 3, 1858, 574. *The same*—The English Bill—The Conference Committee—Compromises and Peace—Closing Speech, April 30, 1858, 604. *The State of the Country*—Speech on the Bill to Admit Kansas into the Union under the Wyandotte Constitution—Labor States and Capital States, February, 1860, 619. *Secession*—Speech at the New England Dinner in New York City, December 21, 1860—Secession and Disunion Considered—General Views, 645. *The State of the Union*—Speech in the Senate—A Review of the Great Controversy—Election of Lincoln, January 12, 1861, 651. *The same*—Remarks on Presenting a Mammoth Petition from the Merchants of New York in Favor of Preserving the Union—Debate with Senator Mason, January 30, 1861, 670.

APPENDIX, ... 679

The Chicago Platform—Speeches at the Chicago Convention, Messrs. EVARTS, ANDREW, SCHURZ, BLAIR, BROWNING, BALDWIN, &c.—Reception Speeches of Gov. Banks, Messrs. Longyear, Abbott, Gov. Randall, Judge Goodrich, Messrs. North, Allison, Boynton, Wilder, Mayor Deitzler, Gov. Robinson Mayor Wentworth, &c.

Mr. Seward's Speech to New York Delegation at Washington, on Inauguration Day March 4, 1861, on his retiring from office as Senator, 692.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX, ... 698

"If you would make it promote most effectually all precious interests, DEDICATE it, I enjoin upon you, as our forefathers dedicated all the Institutions which they established, to the cause of HUMAN NATURE."

BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIR

OF

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

"All my life long
"I have beheld with most respect the man
"Who knew himself and knew the ways before him
"And from amongst them chose considerately
"With a clear courage—not a blindfold courage;
"And having chosen, with a steadfast mind
"Pursued his purposes." TAYLOR.

MEMOIR.[1]

A GLANCE at the memoir of MR. SEWARD, as contained in the first volume of these works, shows us a boyhood passed in the patriotic county of Orange; inspired alike by the ennobling scenery of its natural grandeur and beauty, and the historic recollections of West Point, Newburgh, and Minisink; reminding us how consistently with such early associations, his life, in all its vicissitudes, has displayed the broadest patriotism and the sincerest humanity. It shows us a union from ancestry of Welch perseverance and Celtic generosity that is traceable in every foot-print of his public and private progress. It introduces him to us as a faithful student at Union College ascending to the summit of academic honors, only through the flinty paths of analytical knowledge, acquiring a mental vigor that is noted in every sentence of oration, conversation and private letter, as distinctly as the apple-blossom lives in the autumn fruit. It shows us a young man, not dependent upon a father's competence, journeying far southward to become an instructor, where the practical lessons in the social and political degradations of slavery there learned, became a part of his after career. The glance acquaints us with his legal novitiate with John Duer, and Ogden Hoffman, who loved and respected him to the last of their distinguished lives; and then discovers him in his earliest professional struggles at Auburn, afar from those allurements of city life that so poorly temper thought or strengthen mental conflict. How rarely indeed do districts other than rural, furnish us with statesmen!

[1] Continued from Vol. I.

We see him entering public life just as the debates on the Missouri Compromise had closed—at the age of twenty-three writing a convention address with such prophetic sentences as these:

"When, in Republican states, men attempt to entrench themselves beyond the popular reach, their designs require investigation." "The Judiciary, once our pride, is humbled and degraded." [1]

Our glance shows him entering the state senate quickening its legislative pulse with the suggestions of moral courage, sublime in a young man of nine-and-twenty years, yet put forth with fearlessness and self-abnegation.

It shows him suffering a gubernatorial defeat only to be recommended the more strongly for a renomination and success. As governor we behold him, original, bold, perceptive, and self-reliant in his views and actions—extorting admiration from the very jaws of calumny.

And here we may remark that no position in public life more thoroughly tests a man's ability and character than that of governor of the state of New York. If he who occupies it be not a truly great man, a part of a term will be sufficient to make it apparent. The political knowledge, the financial ability, the legal profundity, the administrative tact, the accomplished yet sincere courtesy, the patience of detail, the coolness of demeanor, the quickness of apprehension, the promptitude of decision, the force of independence and the dignity of character required in a true executive officer of a state like New York, are equal to those several qualities demanded of any ruler in this country or in Europe. When we consider the great metropolis, itself containing a nation, the numerous growing towns, villages and cities, the gigantic systems of internal improvement, the foreign governments on the north, the New England states on the east, Pennsylvania and New Jersey on the south, and the great inland seas on the west; and the party animosities, crime, poverty, tyrannical wealth, exorbitant monopolies, delicate issues of reciprocity, extent of commerce, incessant reforms, unceasing agitations, and jealousy of sects, that exist within and around the Empire State, with all of which, its governor is compelled to deal, the estimate we have given of the importance of the office seems not over-stated.

1 See Vol. III., page 335.

Our glance shows him again as a lawyer turning aside from the affairs of state to those of the humblest client, with a fidelity and integrity of service only equaled by his conscientious devotion to the law and equity of each particular case.

Finally it shows him a senator in congress, asserting with eloquence and courage the supremacy of immutable right in national affairs over the arts of compromise and expediency; standing there, almost alone, setting in motion the tide of freedom, which, rolling from the Aroostook to the Rio del Norte, thunders its warnings in the ears of the million voters who have too long dallied in subserviency to the influence of slavery.

The memoir which follows shows Mr. Seward still in the senate, yearly saluting new associates who displace those who have grown false to freedom and worthless to their constituents—himself, in the judgment of all calm and candid observers, the foremost statesman of American Progress.

THE SUCCESS of the whig party in 1848 was promoted by the expectation that it would prevent the introduction of slavery into the new territories where it was already prohibited by the Mexican laws. The representatives from the free states were understood to be pledged to that wise and beneficent policy. It was assumed that the new president (Gen. Taylor) would not interpose the executive veto should that policy be adopted. Mr. Seward was committed in its favor, both by the circumstances of his election and the well known tenor of his political life. On the meeting of congress in 1849 several whig members from the south apprehended the adoption of that policy and refused to unite with their northern brethren in the election of a speaker. After delaying the organization of the house for a number of weeks they finally joined with their political opponents and elected a democratic speaker from one of the slaveholding states.[1] As soon as the house was organized, the southern party demanded the establishment of the new territories, without any condition as to the introduction of slavery.

[1] Howell Cobb of Georgia. He received 102 votes; Mr. Winthrop of Massachusetts, 99; David Wilmot, 8; Scattering, 12

The representatives from the free states earnestly protested against this course. Mr. Seward took an active part in the opposition. Faithful to their convictions they insisted on the insertion of the Wilmot proviso (which was identical in its spirit with Mr. Jefferson's proviso in the ordinance of 1787) in any act ordaining the government of the territories. President Taylor took a middle ground in his message to congress. He recommended that the territories should be left without any preliminary organization, under the existing Mexican laws, which forbade African bondage, until they should have obtained the requisite population to form voluntary constitutions and apply for admission as states of the Union. California and New Mexico were already taking steps for this purpose. The recommendation of the president was condemned by the slave states while it met the approval of the friends of freedom. At an early period it was opposed by Mr. Clay. After great reserve and deliberation Mr. Webster subsequently declared his hostility to the proposed measure. Mr. Seward, who upheld the recommendation, thus became the leader of the administration party in both houses of congress. The antagonists of slavery with whom he coöperated, a minority in the senate, had a decided majority in the house of representatives. Each branch of congress became the scene of vehement debate. The slaveholding party indulged in such violent and inflammatory language as to threaten the derangement of public business and even the disorganization of congress. This party was sustained by the Nashville convention—a body of southern delegates assembled for the purpose of adopting measures for the secession of the slave states from the Union. But neither President Taylor, nor Mr. Seward was intimidated by these proceedings. They both persisted in the course which was sanctioned alike by justice and conscience. Mr. Clay, on the other hand, believed the existence of the Union was at stake. Sustained by Mr. Webster he consented to adopt the non-intervention policy, the avowal of which by Gen. Cass had made him the candidate of the democratic party, in the recent presidential election. Mr. Clay now brought forward his famous compromise scheme and urged its adoption with all the force of his glowing and persuasive eloquence. Appealing to the sentiment of patriotism, to the prevailing attachment to the Union, and to the love of peace, he represented the acceptance of his measures as essential to the final settlement of the issues which had grown out

of the existence of slavery, in the United States. Mr. Clay's views were sustained by the leading advocates of slavery in congress. For the most part these belonged to the democratic party. They were pledged to insist on a congressional declaration of the right of slaveholders to carry their slaves into any of the territories of the United States. But the compromise was opposed by most of the representatives of the free states, who were determined to make no further concessions than those involved in the position taken by President Taylor. The whigs of the slave states on the other hand gave the compromise their hearty support. It was defended also by the more especial or personal friends of Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster among the whigs of the north, as well as by a large portion of the democratic party in the free states. The more conservative classes in the great northern cities were induced to give it their support through fear of the loss of southern trade and patronage, and a growing discontent with the policy of the new administration. The friends of the compromise moreover endeavored to arouse the fears of the people by showing the danger of a dissolution of the Union which was threatened as they alleged by the policy of the president.

Mr. Seward, of course, was denounced as a desperate and dangerous agitator. His resistance to the compromise was represented as contumacy. He was accused of wishing to obtain personal aggrandizement, even upon the ruins of the Constitution and the wreck of the Union. These reproaches were not without effect. They produced a partial division of the whig party in the free states, and awakened a prejudice in many quarters against the name of Mr. Seward. But he was not shaken from his steadfastness. With admirable firmness and self-possession he nobly resisted the current of popular agitation and congressional excitement. The dignity of his bearing and the wisdom of his counsels during the stormy period receive ample illustration from his speeches, as recorded in previous volumes of these works.

The first applicant for admission into the Union was California, which had adopted a free constitution in a general convention. The friends of the compromise refused to grant her demand, except on certain stringent conditions. They insisted that congress should waive a prohibition of slavery in organizing the territories of Utah

and New Mexico, and at the same time enact a new and offensive law for the capture of fugitive slaves in the free states.

Mr. Seward demanded the admission of California without condition, without qualification and without compromise, leaving other subjects to distinct and independent legislation. No fair man, it would seem, could doubt the wisdom or justice of such a course. The partisans of the compromise contended that Utah and New Mexico should be organized without a prohibition of slavery, at the very moment when the latter was known to have adopted a free constitution and to have chosen representatives to ask an admission into the Union. On this question, Mr. Seward maintained that New Mexico should be admitted into the Union as a free state, or left to enjoy the protection from slavery afforded by existing Mexican laws.

The fugitive slave law, which was proposed as a condition of the admission of California, met with a determined opponent in Mr. Seward, from the first. He clearly foresaw the impolicy as well as the cruelty of the contemplated measure. He argued with no less humanity than good faith, that no public exigency required a new law on the subject, that the bill in question was as unconstitutional as it was repugnant to every just sentiment, and that the principles and habits of the northern people would inevitably place insurmountable obstacles in the way of its execution.[1] Admitting the justice of these views, the compromisers demanded that they should be set aside lest the determination of slaveholders should lead to a dissolution of the Union. Mr. Seward was incapable of yielding to such unworthy terrors. He constantly passed them by, as too trivial for serious notice. At the same time he urgently pointed out the danger of quailing before the threats of the South. Knowing the disposition engendered by slavery, he insisted that any craven truckling on the part of the free states would lead to unbounded aggressions by the slave power in the future. With prophetic sagacity he was enabled to cast the horoscope of coming ills which have since been realized in the legislation concerning Nebraska and Kansas.

The compromisers regarded their measures as essential to the suppression of slavery agitation in the national councils, and to the permanent tranquillity of the Union. Mr. Seward maintained pre-

1 See Vol. I, pp. 65 and 348; also Vol. III, p. 445.

cisely the opposite views. He insisted that the extension of slavery was too great a price to pay even for the attainment of peace; that a peace purchased on such terms would be only a hollow truce; that it would be disturbed by new and deeper agitations; that freedom and slavery were essentially antagonistic in their nature; and that no reconciliation could be effectual until the latter should abandon its pretensions to new territories and new conquests. The soundness of Mr. Seward's opinions have been confirmed by subsequent events. The exciting congressional discussion of the subject continued for several months. Its effect was favorable to the policy of President Taylor and Mr. Seward. It promised to guaranty the establishment of free institutions, unvitiated by the presence of slavery, to the vast possessions between the organized states and the Pacific ocean.

An unforeseen casualty changed the fortunes of the conflict. President Taylor died in the month of July, 1850, and by the terms of the constitution Millard Fillmore, the vice-president, was advanced to the executive chair of the United States. A citizen of New York, he had already exhibited symptoms of jealousy in regard to the influence of Mr. Seward—a feeling which was shared by many of his friends. At the same time he was understood to concur with Mr. Seward in the general principles of policy which had guided the course of the latter on the slavery question. Mr. Seward advised the new president to retain the cabinet of President Taylor and endeavor to carry out his views. But this course was in direct opposition to the views of the compromisers. They urged the importance of abandoning the policy hitherto pursued and of appointing a cabinet committed to their own. Mr. Fillmore accepted their advice. His administration was in reality founded on the principles of the party which his election had defeated. Of course, it relied for support on a coalition between members of that party and so many of his own as could be gained to his views. Soon after this change in the executive, many of the opponents of the compromise fell off from the side of Mr. Seward, while others attempted to steer a middle course, expressing themselves in language of moderation, or preserving a total silence.

Although the compromise bill itself, as introduced by Mr. Clay, was defeated, the measures which it embodied were submitted to a separate discussion, and successively passed. The whigs of the free

states were thrown into perplexity by this sudden change. The coalition demanded the acceptance of the compromise as the final adjustment of the slavery controversy.[1] No favors were to be expected from the administration by those who failed to comply with the terms. A refusal was deemed sufficient evidence of disloyalty to the government and of hostility to the Union. But Mr. Seward was not influenced by the motives thus held out.

His opposition to the compromise measures was unabated. He gave no heed to the denunciations of power. For the present, the vital question had been settled in congress, and had now passed over to the tribunal of the country. In fact, it waited the judgment of the civilized world. Mr. Seward, unwilling to expose himself for a moment to the danger of misapprehension, neglected no proper occasion to declare his adhesion to the principles which he had expressed throughout the congressional debates; although he declined to engage in any defense or explanation of his course amid the excitement of popular assemblies.

The question of slavery, in its comprehensive bearings, formed the turning point in the presidential canvass of 1852, which resulted in the election of Mr. Pierce, and at a subsequent period, in the abrogation of the Missouri compromise and the enactment of the Kansas and Nebraska bill.

The national democratic convention which nominated Mr. Pierce, unanimously adopted a platform approving the compromise of 1850 as the final decision of the slavery question. The whig party were widely divided on the question of acquiescence in the compromise measures, and still more at variance in regard to the claims of rival candidates for the presidency. Mr. Seward's friends in the free states united in the support of General Scott, who had, to a considerable extent, stood aloof from the agitations of the last few years. On the other hand, the exclusive supporters of the compromise, as a condition of party allegiance, were divided between Millard Fillmore, at that time acting president, and Daniel Webster, secretary of state. The whig convention met in Baltimore on the 17th of June, 1852,

1 The bill for the admission of California passed the senate by a vote of 34 to 18, and the house by 150 to 56.

The fugitive slave act, in the senate, received 27 ayes to 12 nays. In the house, under the previous question, it passed without debate. Ayes, 109; nays, 75.

The bill abolishing the slave trade in the District of Columbia passed the senate by 33 to 19; the house by 124 to 59.

Mr. Seward moved a substitute for this bill, abolishing slavery itself in the District. It received only 5 votes.

two weeks after the democratic convention, and nominated General Scott as their candidate for president. A large majority of the delegates from New York and a considerable number from other states, maintained their opposition to the test resolutions which were proposed by the other branch of the party. These resolutions, however, were adopted, and a platform was thus established resembling, in its main features, that of the democrats.[1] Many voted for it who may be presumed to have brought themselves to accept its principles, while others were doubtless influenced by their fears of a disruption of the party. Supported by several advocates of this new platform on the ground of his personal popularity, General Scott received the nomination. He was, however, regarded with great suspicion by a large number of whigs in the slaveholding states. It was feared that if he was elected to the presidency Mr. Seward would be called to the office of secretary of state, and thus exert a leading influence on the administration. General Scott lost no time in attempting to remove these prejudices; and in announcing his acceptance of the nomination, he promptly declared his adhesion to the principles of the platform adopted by the party. At the instance of the friends of the candidate, Mr. Seward disclaimed all private objects in connection with the election of General Scott, and with his characteristic frankness and fidelity to political associates, he publicly announced his determination to accept no office at the hands of the president in case of General Scott's success. This had been his course hitherto, and it would not be changed under a future administration.[2]

Many ardent friends of the compromise, notwithstanding, refused to rally around General Scott, distrusting his fidelity to the compromise platform; while a large number of the whigs of the free states, through aversion to the platform, assumed a neutral position or gave their support to a third candidate.[3] Another portion of the whig party nominated Mr. Webster, who died,[4] not only refusing to decline the nomination, but openly avowing his disgust with the action of the party.

Mr. Seward and his friends could not so far belie their convictions as to approve the principles of the platform, but yielded their

1 The platform was adopted by a vote of 227 to 60. The first ballot for president stood: Fillmore, 133; Scott, 131; Webster, 29. The 53d and last: Scott, 159; Fillmore, 112; Webster, 21.
2 See Vol. III, p. 416.
3 A convention of the free democracy, at Pittsburg, nominated John P. Hale for president, and Geo. W. Julian for vice-president, and declared in favor of "free soil, free land, internal improvements," &c.
4 October 24, 1852.

support to General Scott in the manner which, in their opinion, was best adapted to secure his election and defeat the ultra pro-slavery party. The result, however, was what might have been expected. The democratic party, forgetting its past divisions, at least for the time, supported Mr. Pierce with unanimity and zeal, giving him the electoral votes of twenty-seven of the thirty-one states.[1]

The loud exultations of the prevailing party, as well as of those whigs who had sympathized with it during the canvass, showed their belief that, in the defeat of General Scott, Mr. Seward was not only overthrown, but politically annihilated. The whig party, also, was, in their opinion, forever destroyed, at least as an enemy of the slave power. Many prominent members of that party took an early opportunity of offering their support to Mr. Pierce's administration, while others more secretly, but no less efficiently, gave their aid to its policy.

It was under these discouraging circumstances that Mr. Seward resumed his seat in the senate at the opening of the second session of the thirty-second congress, in December, 1852. But neither his speeches nor his public conduct were colored by the remembrance of the recent disastrous struggle. No traces of disappointment were visible in his bearing, and he at once devoted himself to the business of the session with the same calmness and assiduity which had always marked his congressional career. His speeches during this session were on questions of great practical interest. His remarks in the debate on "Continental Rights and Relations," although grave and forcible, were interspersed with incidental touches of effective satire; and included a graceful and feeling tribute to the character of John Quincy Adams.[2] On the proposal "to abolish or suspend the duty on railroad iron," Mr. Seward addressed the senate in one of his most characteristic speeches,[3] warning the country of the danger of an approaching revulsion in railroad and financial affairs generally, which proved no less just than prophetic. The revulsion predicted actually occurred in 1857. This, and the other speeches made by him during the session, were marked by an admirable union of statistical narrative, general reasoning and lofty sentiments.[4]

1 The states which voted for General Scott were Vermont, Massachusetts, Tennessee and Kentucky. In the free states Mr. Pierce received 1,156,513 votes, General Scott 1,022,757, John P. Hale 157,685. 2 See Vol. III. p. 605. 3 See Vol. III. p. 656.
4 These speeches are briefly noticed in the concluding pages of the Memoir, in Vol. I.

After an extra session of five weeks duration, the senate, on the 11th day of April, 1853, adjourned. Mr. Seward was occupied most of the summer in the courts of the United States.

He, however, found time during the recess to prepare and deliver two addresses of remarkable power and beauty. The first, at the dedication of a university at Columbus, Ohio, rises to the dignity of an oration.[1] In it he pleads eloquently the cause of Human Nature as especially committed to the care of the people of the United States. "To disseminate knowledge and to increase virtue," he maintains, "is to establish the principles on which the recovery and preservation of the inherent rights of man depend, and the state that does this most faithfully, advances most effectually the cause of Human Nature."

In October, he delivered the annual address before the American Institute, in the city of New York.[1] This is a stirring appeal to the American people to rise to a higher tone of individual and national independence in thought, sentiment and action. "Let this prevail," he says, "and we shall cease to undervalue our own farmers, mechanics and manufacturers, and their productions; our own science and literature; in short, our own infinite resources and our own peculiar and justly envied freedom."

Both of these productions possess merit and interest of a permanent character.

On the first Monday in December, 1853, the first congress under Mr. Pierce's administration assembled.[2] It commenced deliberations under inaugural promises which seemed either designedly delusive or promulgated with an imbecility of purpose unworthy a chief magistrate. High expectations of much beneficent legislation had been formed. Among the measures which it was anticipated would come up for consideration were the modification of the tariff so as to enlarge the field of national industry; the construction of a railroad between the Atlantic and Pacific states; the substitution of a system of gratuitous allotments of land in limited quantities to actual settlers, instead of the policy of sales of the public domain; the improvement and reform of the army and navy; the regulation of the commercial marine in regard to immigrant passengers; the endowment of the states with portions of the public lands as a provision for the

1 See present volume.
2 Linn Boyd (democrat) was elected Speaker by 143 votes to 74 for all others. In the senate, the administration was proportionately strong.

care of the insane within their limits; the establishment of steam mails on the Pacific ocean; and the opening of political and commercial relations with Japan.

Mr. Seward addressed himself to the accomplishment of these important objects with his accustomed diligence and zeal. He introduced early in the session a bill for the construction of a railroad to the Pacific; and another for the establishment of steam mails between San Francisco and the Sandwich Islands, Japan, and China. The times seemed favorable for such legislation. The public treasury was overflowing. The slavery agitation apparently had died away both in congress and throughout the country. This calm, however, was doomed to a sudden interruption. The prospect of such extended beneficent legislation was destroyed by the introduction of a measure which at once supplanted all other subjects in congress and in the political interest of the people. This was the novel and astounding proposal of Mr. Douglas, in relation to the Kansas and Nebraska territories. The country saw with regret and mortification the homestead bill transformed into one of mere graduation of the prices of the public lands. The bills for the improvement of the army and navy, and the bill for regulating the transportation of immigrants, were dropped before coming to maturity. The bill for a grant of land to the states in aid of the insane was defeated in the senate for the want of a constitutional majority, after having been vetoed by the president. The bill for establishing the Pacific railroad was lost for want of time to debate it; and the bill for opening steam communication with the East, after passing the senate, failed in the house for want of consideration. Everything gave way to the renewed agitation of the slavery question—an agitation precipitated on an astounded nation by southern influence, yet for which the north has been held accountable ever since, by orators and presses devoted to slave predominance in public affairs, with a persistency that could be called adroit if it were not so obviously false.

The administration had a majority of nearly two to one in both houses; and the opponents of introducing slavery into the free territories constituted less than one-fifth of the senate, and were in a decided minority in the house.[1]

1 At the beginning of the session the house was classified, politically, democrats 159, whigs 71, freesoilers 4: the senate, democrats 36, whigs 20, freesoilers 2.

The measure, already alluded to, which produced this sudden derangement in congress, was a provision in the bill for the organization of a territory in Nebraska, declaring that the states which might at any future time be formed in the new territory should leave the question of slavery to be decided by the inhabitants thereof on the adoption of their constitution. This provision was, as explained by the bill itself, the application of the compromise policy of 1850 to Nebraska, and, as was evident, virtually repealed the Missouri compromise of 1820, which guarantied that slavery should be forever excluded from the territory in question.

But, in order to bring the supporters of the bill and its opponents to a more decided test, an amendment was moved expressly annulling that portion of the Missouri compromise which related to the subject. Mr. Douglas, after some deliberation, accepted the amendment, and modified his plan so far as to introduce a new bill for the organization of Nebraska and Kansas within the same limits, instead of the territory of Nebraska alone, according to the original programme.

The administration lost no time in adopting this policy as their own. It was at first proposed to hasten the passage of the bill through both houses so rapidly as to prevent any remonstrance on the part of the people. But the opponents of the measure, including Mr. Seward, Mr. Chase, Mr. Sumner, Mr. Truman Smith, Mr. Wade, Mr. Everett, Mr. Bell, Mr. Houston and Mr. Fessenden combined against it such an earnest and effective resistance that the attention of the country was aroused, and an indignant protest called forth from the people of the free states. The bill, however, passed the senate on the 4th day of March, 1854, after a discussion which had occupied nearly every day of the session since the 23d of January.[1]

Of the fourteen senators from free states who voted for the bill only three—Messrs Douglas, Gwin, and Thompson of New Jersey—have been reëlected, the others having been succeeded by reliable opponents of the slave power. Of the twelve from free states who voted against it, six have been reëlected, and the places of the others have been filled by republicans, with one exception.[2]

[1] The vote stood as follows: *Yeas*—Adams, Atchison, Bayard, Badger, Benjamin, Brodhead, Brown, Butler, Cass, Clay, Dawson, Dixon, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Evans, Fitzpatrick, Geyer, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pettit, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Slidell, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Thompson of New Jersey, Toucey, Weller, Williams—37; *Nays*—Bell, Chase, Dodge of Wisconsin, Fessenden, Fish, Foot, Hamlin, Houston, James, Seward, Smith, Sumner, Wade, Walker—14.

[2] Mr. Pugh, Democrat, by the vote of a Legislature, elected before the agitation began, succeeded Mr. Chase, Republican, who has in turn been recently chosen to succeed Mr. Pugh.

The bill as it passed the senate contained a provision, known as "Clayton's amendment," restricting the right of suffrage in the territories to citizens and those who had declared their intentions to become such.

On the 21st of March, Mr. Richardson of Illinois, in the house, moved to refer the bill, as it came from the senate, to the committee on territories, of which he was the chairman. Mr. Francis B. Cutting of New York, moved that it be sent to the committee of the whole where it could be freely discussed. His motion was carried, after a severe struggle, by a vote of 110 to 95. This was regarded as a triumph of the enemies of the bill and inspired hopes of its ultimate defeat in the house.

On the 22d of May, after a most exciting contest, lasting nearly two months, in committee of the whole, Mr. Alex. H. Stephens of Georgia, by an extraordinary stratagem in parliamentary tactics succeeded in closing the debate and bringing the bill to a vote in the house, where it finally passed, before adjournment, by a vote of 113 to 100.[1]

As the bill passed the house it differed from the one that came from the senate, chiefly, in being divested of Mr. Clayton's amendment, excluding aliens from voting. It was therefore necessary that it should go back to the senate to be again considered and voted upon.

On the 24th of May, two days after it passed the house, the senate, on motion of Mr. Douglas, proceeded to act upon the bill.

Mr. Pearce of Maryland, renewed Mr. Clayton's amendment, but it now received only seven votes—Messrs. Bayard, Bell, Brodhead, Brown, Clayton, Pearce, and Thompson of Kentucky.

The bill was met on its return by Messrs. Seward, Sumner and Chase with a continued and powerful opposition. But it was all to no effect. The bill again passed the senate by a vote of 35 to 13; and amid the firing of cannon and the shouting of its friends, it was sent to the president for his signature, at three o'clock in the morning of May 26, 1854. President Pierce promptly gave it his approval, and the odious measure became the law of the land.

[1] Among the Democrats who voted in the minority were Messrs. Banks of Massachusetts, Davis of Rhode Island, Fenton of New York, Grow of Pennsylvania, Jones of New York, Wentworth of Illinois, and several others who have since returned to the democratic party. From the south Messrs Benton of Missouri, Cullom, Etheridge and Taylor of Tennessee, Hunt of Louisiana, Millson of Virginia, Puryear and Rogers of North Carolina, voted against the measures. With these exceptions the bill was supported by the democrats of the north and south and the southern whigs.

Thus was abrogated the Missouri compromise—a law enacted thirty years before with all the solemnity of a compact between the free and the slave states—and a territory as large as the thirteen original states opened to slavery. The act was consummated by the coöperation of the north. Originating with a senator from a free state, it was passed by a congress containing in each branch a majority of members from the free states, and was sanctioned by the approval of a free state president.

The friends of this legislation attempted to defend it on the pretence that it was not an original act, but only declaratory of the true intent and significance of the compromise measures of 1850. For his resistance to those measures, Mr. Seward had been vehemently denounced. But at the very commencement of the Nebraska struggle, the friends of freedom at the north turned their eyes toward him as their devoted champion. He was beset with appeals on all sides to awaken the country to the atrocity of the proposed transaction. In no quarter were these appeals more urgent than in the city of New York, where his opposition to the compromise of 1850 had been most severely condemned. With his usual sagacity and confidence in the popular impulse, and faithful to his innate sense of personal dignity, he kept aloof from these overtures, and was content with the zealous discharge of his senatorial duties on the floor of congress. A characteristic letter, in reply to an invitation to address a public meeting in the city of New York, in the midst of the excitement, will be found in this volume. He closes his letter with these words:

"I beg you to be assured that, while declining to go into popular assemblies as an agitator, I shall endeavor to do my duty here, with as many true men as shall be found in a delegation which, if all were firm and united in the maintenance of public right and justice, would be able to control the decision of this question. But the measure of success and effect which shall crown our exertions must depend now, as heretofore, on the fidelity with which the people whom we represent shall adhere to the policy and principles which are the foundation of their own unrivalled prosperity and greatness."

The pledges given in this letter were nobly fulfilled. The first of his speeches on the Nebraska bill was a profound and dispassionate statement of the whole argument against the measure, alike remarkable for compact narrative and logical arrangement. Though

it failed of preventing the accomplishment of the measure in congress, it acted with magnetic power on the people of the free states, arousing them to a spirit of unconquerable resistance to the aggressions of slavery. The conclusion of this speech, as we read it now, seems like the prophecy of inspiration. Its last words were: "There "is a Superior Power that overrules all your actions and all your "refusals to act, and I fondly hope and trust overrules them to the "advancement of the happiness, greatness and glory of our country— "that overrules, I know, not only all your actions and all your refu- "sals to act, but all human events, to the distant but inevitable result "of the equal and universal liberty of all men."

It was a gloomy night for the lovers of freedom when the telegraphic despatches flashed throughout the country, announcing that the ill-omened bill was on its final reading in the senate. Mr. Seward chose that hour of intense excitement to close the debate on his part. The commencement of his speech was solemn and impressive. He reviewed the sophistries which had been offered in defense of the bill with a clearness and power that might almost have arrested its progress even on the verge of enactment. Presenting to the free states the evidences of their ability to procure a repeal of the law, he urged, by conclusive arguments, the importance of such a step, and, at the same time, luminously expounded the methods of excluding slavery from Nebraska, Kansas, and the vast unsettled regions of the west, by aiding and promoting a rapid and systematic emigration into the territories in question. The effect of this speech was cheering in the extreme. It threw a rainbow across the dark cloud that hung over the country. The auspicious omen was accepted; and the faith of the people has since been rewarded by the most gratifying results.[1]

Besides these two important speeches, Mr. Seward made several other elaborate efforts in the senate during this eventful session. One, on the bill granting lands to the several states for the relief of the indigent insane, is deserving of especial notice. This measure (known as "Miss Dix's bill for the insane") had passed both houses,[2] and been returned to the senate by the president with a veto message

[1] An Emigrant Aid Society was immediately formed in Washington among members of congress, and others soon sprang up in New England and various parts of the country.

[2] In the senate it received 35 votes, with but 12 against it. In the house the yeas were 81, the nays 53.

Mr. Seward's remarks were devoted mainly to a review of the president's message, which he characterized as desultory, illogical and confused. He concludes with an eloquent and pertinent vindication of the rights and interests of the individual states of the Union. He desired "not to abate the federal strength and diminish the majesty of the Union, but to invigorate and aggrandize the states, and to enable them to maintain their just equilibrium in one grand but exquisitely contrived political system." The bill failed to pass over the president's veto, and has never since been successfully revived.

Mr. Seward advocated, at different times during the session, a system of postal reform. But this, like other measures of public benefit, was lost amid the general wreck. He was especially desirous of securing greater expedition and safety in the transmission of the mails between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. A proposition to give one hundred thousand dollars to the brave sailors who rescued the survivors of the wreck of the steamer San Francisco, lost at sea with two hundred and forty lives on the 5th of January, 1854, received his support. His speech in its behalf was characterized by a generous humanity as well as by sound views of public policy.

The project of acquiring Cuba was broached in the senate soon after the passage of the Nebraska bill. Mr. Seward spoke at some length on the Africanization of the island. He opposed the bill to suspend the duties on railroad iron, as contrary to a wise and sound policy.

The homestead bill always found in Mr. Seward a steady supporter. In a speech made on the 12th of July, 1854, in defense of this measure, he took occasion to express his views very freely on what was then called "know nothingism."

In the debate on "appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors," Mr. Seward energetically contended for the interests of commerce and navigation on the great lakes, reviewing severely the president's veto of a previous bill.

During the discussion of the Kansas and Nebraska bill in the house of representatives, a memorial remonstrating against the repeal of the Missouri compromise signed by three thousand and fifty clergymen of New England, was presented to the senate by Edward Everett. Mr. Douglas and other senators attacked this memorial with great violence, severely criticising its language, questioning its propriety and denying the claim of its authors to a hearing in the

senate. Mr. Seward, maintaining the right of petition on its broadest grounds, defended the course of the memorialists, and in a brief speech sustained his positions with his accustomed vigor and acumen. After a spirited debate the petition was received in the usual manner and laid on the table. But the dignified defense of the remonstrants, made by Mr. Seward, was remembered with favor by the lovers of justice and freedom of conscience in all parts of the country.

Two unusually important treaties were ratified by the senate, in executive or secret session, during this meeting of congress. One is known as the "Gadsden treaty" for the settlement of our relations with Mexico, and the other as the "reciprocity treaty" for the regulation of trade between Canada and the United States. Mr. Seward is understood to have opposed the former, while he gave his support to the latter.

Just before the adjournment of congress (on the 26th of July, 1854) Mr. Seward delivered the annual oration before the Phi Beta Kappa society of Yale college, on which occasion he received the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The subject of his discourse was, "the physical, moral and intellectual development of the American people,"[1] which he treated with great discrimination and vigorous eloquence, commanding the admiration of a highly intellectual audience and strengthening his well earned title to oratorical fame.

After an arduous session of more than eight months, congress adjourned on the 7th of August, 1854. In October, following, Mr. Seward made an elaborate argument in the circuit court of the United States at Albany, in the celebrated McCormick reaper case.

The state elections, in the autumn, in all the free states, resulted in a decided verdict against the extraordinary legislation of congress and the action of the administration. Only seventy-nine members were elected, in all the states, to the next congress who were known as friends of the president's policy,[2] while one hundred and seventeen were chosen as decided opponents of the repeal of the Missouri compromise. The remaining thirty-seven members, classed as whigs or Americans, were generally supposed to sympathize with the administration in its pro-slavery character, although unwilling to be classed as its friends.

1 See present volume for this oration and the speeches before noticed.
2 At the election for speaker the administration candidate, Mr. Richardson, the father of the Nebraska bill in the house, at the previous session, received on the first ballot 74 votes.

The second and last session of the thirty-third congress met on the first Monday in December, 1854. A manifestly subdued temper on the part of the majority and the absence of any exciting topic for discussion gave hopes of much healthful legislation, only however to be disappointed.

Mr. Seward, with his accustomed assiduity, turned his attention to the task of rescuing from the ruins some of the beneficent measures sacrificed to the interests of slavery at the last session. Among these the Pacific railroad, the improvement of rivers and harbors and the revision of the tariff may be especially mentioned. Mr. Seward was the author of a bill, introduced by him at the previous session, for the construction of a railroad to the Pacific ocean, which seemed more practical in its character than any yet considered.

A bill to increase the compensation of members of congress and to raise the salaries of the judges of the supreme court was introduced early in the session. Mr. Seward opposed both propositions. In a speech on the "extension of the bounty land law" he paid an eloquent tribute to the volunteers and militia who had served in the wars of the United States, and advocated an amendment providing that they should be included in the benefits of the law the same as officers and soldiers of the regular army. On presenting a memorial from the unemployed workmen of the city of New York in favor of a homestead law, Mr. Seward feelingly portrayed the distress he had himself recently witnessed among the industrial classes in the large cities, and urged the passage of the homestead bill as a wise and inexpensive measure of relief.

His remarks on internal improvements, during the debate on the bill making appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and his speeches in favor of the Pacific railroad all abound with the most liberal and statesmanlike ideas; while those in opposition to reducing the tariff on American products and manufactures are consistent with the principles he has always maintained.

Mr. Seward insisted on the payment of the Texas debts as an obligation entered into by our government which could not now be honorably repudiated, however unwise that obligation may have been when it was assumed.

He was the early and steadfast friend of mail steamers on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. His speech on the 27th of February,

1855, although brief, clearly presents the reasons why our government should continue to employ first class steamships in its mail service. Mr. Seward opposed the bill granting three years' credit on duties on railroad iron. He maintained that it was impolitic and wrong to stimulate an enterprise already unduly expanded. The wisdom of his words has been verified by the remarkable depreciation of railroad shares.

A misunderstanding having arisen among the merchants of New York in regard to a bill introduced at the last session, by Senator Fish, relating to immigrant passenger ships, Mr. Seward in a graceful speech defended his colleague from any negligence in the matter, Mr. Fish being then absent from the country seeking the restoration of his health.

Near the close of the session, Senator Toucey introduced a bill designed to strengthen the already rigid features of the fugitive slave act of 1850. It provided that all suits growing out of the enforcement of that act might be removed from any state court, in which they had been commenced, to the federal courts. On the 26th of May, 1854, the day on which the Nebraska bill passed, Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave from Virginia, had been arrested in Boston by the officers of the federal government. In an unsuccessful attempt by the people to rescue him from the hands of the marshal and his deputies, one of the latter was killed. The fugitive, having been declared by the commissioner to be a slave, was conducted from the court house to a revenue cutter in the harbor by a company of marines and United States soldiers, assisted by the volunteer militia of the city of Boston. Cannon loaded with grape shot were planted in commanding positions to preserve order, and the court house, surrounded by chains, was guarded by an armed police. During this extraordinary scene many acts of tyranny were practiced by the federal officers on the people occupying or passing through the streets. The civil and criminal prosecutions growing out of such acts were commenced in the courts of Massachusetts. One of the objects of Mr. Toucey's bill was to change the jurisdiction from these tribunals to the courts of the United States.

Mr. Seward aroused the attention of the senate and of the country to the enormous usurpation which the bill proposed, in a speech of stirring eloquence; reviewing the recent startling encroachments of

despotism and characterising the present one as more bold and alarming than any that had preceded it.[1] Other senators from the free states followed him in denouncing it, in terms no less severe and decided.

Mr. Sumner, at the close of an eloquent speech against the bill, moved, as an amendment, a substitute for the whole bill, *repealing* the fugitive slave act of 1850. Mr. Seward gladly availed himself of the opportunity to record his vote in favor of the repeal of that odious act; but the proposition could then command only nine affirmative votes, Messrs. Brainerd of Vermont, Chase of Ohio, Cooper of Pennsylvania, Fessenden of Maine, Gillette of Connecticut, Seward of New York, Sumner of Massachusetts, Wade of Ohio, and Wilson of Massachusetts.

Mr. Toucey's bill, after a most animated discussion, passed the senate at midnight by a vote of 29 to 9. Owing to the lateness of the session its consideration in the house was never reached; nor has it since been revived. The days of the thirty-third congress were now numbered, and on the 3d of March, 1855, both houses adjourned *sine die.*

This congress, the first under Mr. Pierce's administration, will long be memorable not only for its entire failure to accomplish any great and beneficent acts of legislation, but also for having deliberately re-opened a discussion of the slavery question whose ultimate consequences and collateral results no prophet can foresee.

With this congress, Mr. Seward's first senatorial term expired. His individual interests and personal feelings led him to prefer a return to private life. But higher considerations prevailed, and he consented to be a candidate for reëlection. His views on this subject were well expressed in a letter to John Quincy Adams in 1841, and substantially repeated to those who now felt, as he thought, an undue anxiety that he should be reëlected. He says in his letter to his venerable friend: "As for the future, I await its developments without concern, conscious that if my services are needed, they will be demanded, if not needed that it would be neither patriotic nor conducive to my own happiness to be in public life;" sentiments whose unaffected modesty of utterance, yet epigrammatic beauty, would, if found in Roman history, attract the admiration of the world.

1 Mr. Seward's speeches on this, and other bills before noticed, will be found in succeeding pages of the present volume.

The election of members of the legislature in the state of New York in the autumn of 1854, was held in view of the fact that they would be called at the coming session to elect a senator of the United States.

The reëlection of Mr. Seward, of course, formed a prominent question in the canvass. The element of "know nothingism" or "Americanism," also greatly influenced the election of the members of the Assembly as well as of the various state officers chosen at the same time. To some extent the issue was, from this cause, confused and the result uncertain. Mr. Seward's whole life had been in opposition to secret societies and to any limitation of the political rights of the people. The new party, now at its height, was founded as he believed, substantially, on ideas directly in conflict with his matured convictions. At a time when other statesmen were courting the new element or being reticent before its influence, Mr. Seward, in the senate, frankly expressed his opposition to these secret political organizations. With such circumstances and antagonisms to overcome, with a combination of democrats and Americans against him, his past services, his devotion to the cause of freedom and humanity, and his fidelity to all the great interests of his native state and the country, were submitted to the people of New York for their verdict.

The election took place on the first Tuesday in November, and was contested with unusual vigor throughout the state. Although the democrats succeeded in electing but forty-two members of the assembly out of one hundred and twenty-eight, loud boasts were made by the opponents of Mr. Seward that he could not be reëlected. The most industrious efforts were made to excite new animosities and revive old prejudices against him in order to defeat his reëlection. The authors of these efforts and the character of their weapons were various. One spirit, however, animated the whole. The slave power projected or applauded every shaft of calumny that was directed at the object of its greatest fear.

The legislature met on the first Tuesday in January, 1855. The assembly chose Mr. Littlejohn speaker, eighty to thirty-eight. The senate, which held over from the last year, was divided, whigs eighteen, democrats ten, know nothings four. Before the day appointed for the election of senator, a discussion arose in the assembly, in

which Mr. Seward's public life was subjected to a searching review. As this debate proceeded his friends felt an increasing confidence in his success. At the same time his opponents, with apparent sincerity, continued to assert that his election by the present legislature was impossible. Under these circumstances the excitement rose to a great height. Throughout the Union the contest was regarded as one between freedom and slavery.

On the first Tuesday in February the election took place. In the senate Mr. Seward received eighteen votes, Daniel S. Dickinson five, W. F. Allen two, Millard Fillmore, Ogden Hoffman, Preston King, Daniel Ullman, George R. Babcock, and S. E. Church one each.

In the assembly the vote stood, for Mr. Seward sixty-nine, Mr. Dickinson fourteen, Horatio Seymour twelve, Washington Hunt nine, John A. Dix seven, Mr. Fillmore four, and eleven others one each.

The senate and assembly then in joint session compared nominations and the lieutenant-governor declared William H. Seward duly elected a senator of the United States for six years from the 4th of March, 1855.

This announcement soon reached every part of the Union, and in all the free states it was received with demonstrations of joy and approval. In Washington the rejoicing among Mr. Seward's political and personal friends, in congress, and among the people of that city, was no less enthusiastic and sincere than in other portions of the country.

On his return to his home in Auburn, Mr. Seward was everywhere greeted with the hearty congratulations of his friends. He, however, declined the various public ovations tendered to him in different places.

During the canvass for the annual state election in the autumn of 1855, Mr. Seward, at the earnest solicitation of his political friends, addressed the people at Albany, Auburn and Buffalo. These speeches are standard political dissertations. They produced a marked effect, not only in his own state but throughout the country. President Pierce in his annual message to congress saw fit to allude to some of the sentiments contained in the one delivered in the capitol at Albany. This speech entitled "The danger of extending slavery," or "The privileged class," and the one delivered at Buffalo,

"The contest and the crisis," were very widely circulated in news papers and pamphlets.

On the 22d of December, 1855, Mr. Seward delivered the annual oration at Plymouth, Massachusetts, in commemoration of the landing of the pilgrims. At the dinner table he also made a brief but eloquent speech in response to a complimentary sentiment. His large and cultivated audience gave repeated expressions of their sympathy and delight, with the sentiments of the oration and the speech.[1]

The summer of 1855 seemed to be marked by a number of occurrences showing the aggressive and tyrannical spirit of the slave power. On the 27th of July, Passmore Williamson, a respectable and benevolent citizen of Philadelphia, was thrown into prison in that city and confined fourteen weeks. He was charged with a "contempt of court." The facts of the case were, briefly, these: a Mr. Wheeler came from a slave state into Pennsylvania, bringing with him a slave woman, who became, by the laws of Pennsylvania, *free* on being brought into the state. This fact was communicated to her by Mr. Williamson, and she immediately left her master, never to return. In a suit growing out of these circumstances, Mr. Williamson, in his answer to a writ of *habeas corpus*, stated what he deemed to be the truth in the case. Judge Kane pronounced his reply a contempt of court, and sent him to prison.

A similar case occurred in New York some time previous, showing the same determination of the south to extend slavery over the free states of the north. A Mr. Lemmon, traveling from Virginia

1 The following notice of the celebration and oration is taken from one of the newspapers of the day: Plymouth was thronged on the 21st of December. The celebration was the most impressive and spirited of any which the descendants of those valiant men have made. The "Rock" was carefully dug out for the occasion. The relics of the Mayflower and the mementoes of her passage across the ocean, and her priceless freight and great mission, were displayed in pilgrims' hall. The streets were filled with strangers, arrived from the vicinity of Plymouth not only, but from remote states.

A procession with music, religious exercises in a church, an oration, a costly and most generous dinner-feast with toasts and speeches, and a ball in the evening constituted the celebration. Of the oration delivered by Governor Seward, we need but to say that it is the expression of that statesman's philosophy and policy.

Among the incidents of the dinner table, Wendell Phillips declared that he would not acknowledge the right of Plymouth to the "Rock." "It underlies" said he "the whole country and only crops out here. It cropped out where Putnam said—"Don't fire, boys, until you see the whites of their eyes." It showed itself where Ingraham rescued Martin Kotsza from Austrian despotism. Jefferson used it for his writing-desk, and Lovejoy levelled his musket across it at Alton. I recognized the clink of it to-day when the great apostle of the higher law laid his beautiful garland upon the sacred altar." [Mr. Seward remarked that he was not a descendant of the pilgrims of the Mayflower.] "He says he is not descended from the Mayflower," resumed Mr. Phillips; "that is a mistake. There is such a thing as pedigree of mind as well as of body."

to Texas, with eight slaves, sailed from Norfolk to the city of New York, intending there to tranship his family and property to Texas. His slaves were, like the woman in Philadelphia, restored to freedom by the laws of the state in which they were domiciled. An expensive litigation was immediately commenced by the state of Virginia against the state of New York, which is not yet concluded.[1]

The state courts of primary and final resort have confirmed the right of the slaves to their freedom, but an appeal has been entered to the supreme court of the United States. The democratic judges delivered dissenting opinions accepting the new dogma that slaves are property under the constitution. Their ideas were foreshadowed by the counsel for Virginia,[2] who reiterated in the court room the same plea for the justice and beneficence of African slavery which he had a month before presented at a public meeting in New York.

But the country was soon agitated by acts of yet greater atrocity and of more public interest. Soon after the adjournment of congress systematic efforts began to be made by the south to make Kansas a slave state. The means adopted, and the outrages, arsons and murders committed in the attempt, are still recent and well impressed on the public mind.

At the first election in the territory (March 30, 1855), large parties of armed intruders from Missouri took possession of the polls and returned such members to the territorial legislature as would carry out the pro-slavery plans. Of the 2,905 voters in the territory according to the census, only 831 voted, while 4,908 illegal votes were polled by the Missourians.

Governor Reeder, appointed by President Pierce, was removed from his office by the same power that had appointed him, for refusing to countenance the frauds and outrages of the pro-slavery mob.

The legislature, chosen in this fraudulent manner, passed acts, among others, making it a capital offense to assist slaves either in escaping into the territory or out of it; and felony, punishable with imprisonment for from two to five years, to circulate anti-slavery publications or to deny the right to hold slaves in the territory; requiring all voters, officers and attorneys to take an oath to support

1 These cases seem to warrant sufficiently Mr. Seward's apprehension that the result of the slavery aggressions unchecked, will be, the spread of slavery over all the free states, as expressed in his Rochester speech. See present volume.

2 Charles O'Conor, Esq.

the fugitive slave law and all the acts of this pretended legislature; giving the selection of jurors to the sheriff; and admitting any person to vote who should pay one dollar, poll tax, whether a resident of the territory or not. They also adopted, in gross, the Missouri code of laws.

A convention of delegates, chosen by the real inhabitants of the territory, was held at Topeka in October, 1855, which adopted a free state constitution to be submitted to the people for approval. This constitution was subsequently adopted by the almost unanimous vote of the settlers. Under this constitution Charles Robinson was elected governor and a state government organized. President Pierce, however, in a special message to congress in January, 1856, indorsed the fraudulent legislature and denounced the formation of the Topeka government as an act of rebellion.

Innumerable outrages continued to be perpetrated on the persons and property of the free state settlers by Missourians and others, although the president declared in his annual message, on the 28th of December, "that nothing had occurred in Kansas to warrant his interference."

The thirty-fourth congress assembled on its usual day, in December, 1855. The senate was organized without delay. In the house there was a protracted and extraordinary contest in the election of a speaker. Ballotings were continued almost daily, without success, until the 2d day of February, 1856, when the plurality rule, by a vote of one hundred and thirteen to one hundred and four, was adopted.

On the one hundred and thirty-fourth ballot, after ineffectual attempts to rescind the plurality rule, Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, was elected speaker, having received one hundred and three votes to one hundred for William Aiken, of South Carolina. There were also eleven scattering votes, nine of which were cast by northern men hitherto counted as opponents of the Nebraska and Kansas measures. Nineteen members were absent or did not vote, and there was one vacancy. Twelve of the nineteen not voting were from northern states. A resolution declaring Mr. Banks duly elected was passed by ayes one hundred and fifty-five, nays forty.

One of the first acts of the house of representatives after its organization, was to appoint a committee to proceed to Kansas to inquire into the validity of the election of the pretended legislature and

delegate to congress. Their report completely established the fraudulent character of the election and the truth of all the outrages complained of by the free state inhabitants.

In the senate a debate of considerable interest, on the "Clayton and Bulwer treaty," occupied the first weeks of the session. Mr. Seward in several able speeches defended the rights and interests of his own country and clearly defined the nature and provisions of the treaty.

On the 24th of January, 1856, the president brought the affairs of Kansas before congress in a special message which gave rise to a protracted discussion in both houses. In the senate the subject was debated for nearly six months with little interruption.

Mr. Seward at the earliest opportunity introduced a bill for the immediate admission of Kansas into the Union. "In offering this proposition," says Mr. Sumner, in his famous speech of the 20th of May, the senator from New York has entitled himself to the gratitude of the country. He has, throughout a life of unsurpassed industry and of eminent ability, done much for freedom which the world will not let die; but he has done nothing more opportune than this, and he has uttered no words more effective than the speech, so masterly and ingenious, by which he has vindicated it."

On the 12th of March, Mr. Douglas, from the committee on territories, submitted a report extenuating the outrages committed in the territory and severely denouncing the action of the New England Emigrant Aid Society.

Mr. Collamer from the minority of the same committee at the same time presented an able report, taking entirely different views; views that have since been fully substantiated. On the 7th of April, Senator Cass presented the memorial of the Topeka legislature, asking for the admission of Kansas into the Union. A number of resolutions and bills were introduced at different times, by senators of both parties, providing for a settlement of the serious difficulties existing in the territory. On the 3d of July a bill passed the house for the admission of Kansas into the Union under the Topeka constitution by a vote of ninety-nine to ninety-seven. It was sent to the senate on the following Monday and referred to the committee on territories. On the 8th of July Mr. Douglas, chairman of the committee, reported a substitute for the bill, authorizing the people of Kansas, under certain restrictions, to form a state constitution.

The substitute passed the senate on the same day, ayes thirty, nays thirteen. The house refused to recede from its previous action. The senate declined to pass Mr. Seward's bill or the one which came from the house, substantially similar, and in this manner all relief to Kansas was denied. Mr. Seward's speeches at various stages of the extended debate are given in full in this volume. His eloquent and masterly statements of the subject will be read with equal pleasure and instruction, as the best history of the great transaction.

On the 22d day of May, 1856, a violent assault was committed in the senate chamber, immediately after the adjournment, upon Charles Sumner, by Preston S. Brooks, a representative from South Carolina. The blows were inflicted with a heavy cane while Mr. Sumner was sitting at his desk in the act of writing. A number of Mr. Brooks' friends were present, including Mr. Douglas, witnesses of the attack, none of whom attempted to prevent or arrest it. On the next morning Senator Wilson (Mr. Sumner's colleague), briefly stated the facts to the senate. Without making any motion, he said, "I leave it to older senators whose character, whose position in this body and before the country eminently fit them for the task of devising means to redress the wrongs of a member of this body and to vindicate the honor and dignity of the senate." Mr. Seward waited a reasonable time for some senator in the majority to offer a resolution on the subject. He then moved that a committee of five be appointed by the president of the senate to inquire into the circumstances of the case and to report thereon to the senate. Under parliamentary usage Mr. Seward would have been placed on this committee as its chairman. To avoid doing this, the senate changed their custom and elected the committee by ballot. Neither Mr. Seward nor any personal or political friend of Mr. Sumner's was chosen a member of the committee. The committee reported that the senate had no jurisdiction in the case,[1] and their report was adopted.

Mr. Seward, as the intimate associate and cherished friend of Mr. Sumner, was deeply moved by the whole transaction. He, nevertheless, so disciplined his feelings that his speeches on the subject, although full of eloquent denunciation of the outrage, were characterized by his usual dignity of tone and moderation of language.

1 The house voted to expel Mr. Brooks, one hundred and twenty-one to ninety-five. The motion required a vote of two-thirds. Mr. Brooks resigned, and was re-elected. He died suddenly January 27, 1857.

The state of Massachusetts having sent to the senate a series of resolutions relating to this serious attack upon one of her senators, Mr. Seward, in a very appropriate and feeling speech, reviewed the whole affair, and vindicated the legislature of that state in the course it had adopted.

"Every one knew," said Mr. Seward, "that the sufferer in that scene was my cherished personal friend and political associate. Every one knew that he had fallen senseless and, for all that was at first known, lifeless, on the floor of the senate of the United States, for utterances which, whether discreet or indiscreet, were utterances made in the cause of truth, humanity, and justice—a cause in which he was a distinguished fellow-laborer with myself."

Besides the speeches made by Mr. Seward on "Kansas affairs," the "Clayton and Bulwer treaty," and the "Sumner assault," he also spoke at considerable length on the naval retiring board; the origination of appropriation bills; Senator Trumbull's seat; the Danish Sound dues; Nicaragua; the compensation bill; military and civic officers; and mail steamers. He also delivered a brief eulogium on the Hon. T. H. Bayley, late a representative from Virginia and formerly governor of that state.

Congress adjourned on the 18th of August, 1856. But it having failed to grant the required supplies for carrying on the Indian wars, the president convened an extra session, which met on the 23d of the same month. Mr. Seward's speeches at this session, on the army bill and its relation to the affairs of Kansas, throw new light on the subject. The extra session terminated on the 30th of August.

On the 22d day of February, 1856, a convention, representing the people of various sections of the country, opposed to the recent repeal of the Missouri compromise, the invasion of Kansas, and the aggressions of slavery, assembled at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

At this meeting the initiative steps were taken for the national organization of the republican party. Delegates from every free state, and from Kentucky, Maryland, and Virginia, were present. The venerable Francis P. Blair, of Maryland, presided; and among the members present were some of the most distinguished leaders of the whig and democratic parties.

The convention issued an eloquent and stirring address[1] to the people, and called a national convention to meet in Philadelphia, on the

[1] This address was written by Hon. H. J. Raymond, editor of the New York Times and lieutenant-governor of New York.

17th of June ensuing, to nominate candidates for the offices of president and vice-president of the United States. State conventions of a similar kind had been held in most of the free states. One, at Saratoga Springs, in the state of New York, in August, 1854, was remarkable alike for its great numbers and respectable character.[1]

On the 17th of June, 1856, in pursuance of the call adopted at Pittsburgh, a convention of the opponents of the recent aggressions of the slave power, and friends of the admission of Kansas as a free state and the restoration of the action of the federal government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson, assembled in Philadelphia to nominate candidates for the offices of president and vice-president of the United States.

A democratic convention, held at Cincinnati on the 2d day of the same month, nominated James Buchanan for the presidency; and the Americans had nominated Mr. Fillmore as early as February preceding.

The Philadelphia convention presented the names of John C. Fremont, of California, and William L. Dayton, of New Jersey, as their candidates,[2] and adopted a resolution in its platform inviting the affiliation and coöperation of all freemen supporting its principles, however differing in other respects. The supporters of this ticket became known throughout the Union as the "Republican Party," and entered upon the contest with a zeal inspired by their devotion to the cause of human nature. The following extracts from the platform adopted by this convention contain the essential principles of the new party:

"*Resolved*, That, with our republican fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth, that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior designs of our federal government were, to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that, as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, it becomes

[1] Among the distinguished men of all parties who participated in its proceedings were Preston King, John A. King, William T. McCoun, Robert Emmett, John Jay, Horace Greeley, and Henry J. Raymond.

[2] On the first ballot, Colonel Fremont had three hundred and fifty-eight votes and Judge McLean one hundred and ninety-nine. On the second, the vote stood five hundred and thirty-four to thirty-seven for the same candidates. The names of Messrs. Seward, Chase and others were withdrawn before any ballot was taken. For vice-president, on an informal ballot, Mr. Dayton received two hundred and fifty-nine, Abraham Lincoln one hundred and ten, David Wilmot forty-three, Charles Sumner thirty-six.

our duty to maintain this provision of the constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in any territory of the United States, by positive legislation, prohibiting its existence or extension therein. That we deny the authority of congress, of a territorial legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States, while the present constitution shall be maintained."

"*Resolved*, That the constitution confers upon congress sovereign power over the territories of the United States for their government, and that, in the exercise of this power, it is both the right and the duty of congress to prohibit in the territories those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery."

Mr. Seward engaged in the presidential canvass with his accustomed zeal and ability. His speeches at Auburn, Detroit, and Oswego are consummate statements of the questions at issue, and masterly expositions of the republican creed. Like nearly all his speeches, they possess an interest and value beyond the occasion that produced them.

The election resulted in the choice of Mr. Buchanan, and in the success of the democratic party in the nation. In thirteen of the sixteen free states, however, the republicans elected their state tickets and gave Colonel Fremont a majority, in those states, of more than two hundred thousand votes over Mr. Buchanan. In New York, the republicans elected twenty-five members of Congress and the entire state administration. Colonel Fremont's plurality in the state over Mr. Buchanan was eighty thousand—over Mr. Fillmore one hundred and fifty-two thousand. Only two free states (Pennsylvania and Indiana) cast a majority of their popular votes for Mr. Buchanan.

In the slaveholding states, the republicans were not allowed to maintain an organization. Individuals expressing sentiments in favor of the republican party were driven from their homes, and became exiles in the free north. A few republican votes, less than twelve hundred in all, were given in the more favored portions of Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, and Virginia.

Although failing of complete success, the "friends of human liberty" had now organized a party of more than thirteen hundred

thousand intelligent freemen, never to be disbanded until a triumph over slavery has been achieved.

Such a party had long existed in the prophetic vision of Mr. Seward. He had himself planted the acorn from which this vigorous tree had sprung, nearly twenty years ago, when he was governor of his native state; and his life may be said to have been spent in watching and cultivating its growth. In 1845, in a private letter to a friend, Mr. Seward, in full view of the then recent triumph of the slave power in the annexation of Texas and the election of President Polk, thus clearly indicated the rallying of this new party:

"Friends of human liberty," he wrote, "may for a season be divided, and range themselves under different banners, but time will speedily indicate a rallying ground, and that ground being once gained, they will be invincible.

"There is no enchantment against them—neither is there any divination against their sublime and benevolent mission.

"Let it be pursued in a spirit of patriotism and christian charity—let our motto be uncompromising hostility to human slavery—peace and security to the slave-holder, and perpetual support of the American Union."

The third session of the thirty-fourth congress assembled on the first Monday in December, 1856.

Among its earliest proceedings was the announcement of the death of John M. Clayton. Mr. Seward's eulogium on the character of this eminent statesman was an eloquent and feeling tribute to an old political associate and personal friend.

The claims of the officers of the revolutionary army were ably advocated by Mr. Seward in a speech of great research and power. He showed by abundant evidence that the bill before the senate rested on the policy established by General Washington himself, while at the head of the army, and throughout the war; and that its enactment would be the fulfillment of his promises and more acceptable to his serene and awful shade than all the tributes which have been paid, and all that are yet to be paid, by a redeemed nation and grateful world.

Among the new republican senators who appeared in the senate at the present session was James Harlan, of Iowa. His right to his seat, however, was disputed by the majority and was arbitrarily denied to him, by a vote of twenty-eight to eighteen. Mr. Seward, in a lucid argument, conclusively established the validity of Mr

Harlan's election, and the legislature of Iowa confirmed it at their next session by a decisive majority. On the 23d of December, 1856, Mr. Seward submitted a resolution to the senate, which was unanimously adopted, requesting the president to communicate to the senate such information as he might have, concerning the present condition and prospects of a proposed plan for connecting, by submarine wires, the magnetic telegraph lines on this continent and Europe. On the 7th of January the president replied, transmitting a report from the secretary of state. Mr. Seward, on the 9th of the same month, introduced a bill to expedite telegraph communication for the use of the government in foreign intercourse. The senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill after it had been reported upon, favorably, by a committee, without amendment, and after an interesting debate passed it by a vote of twenty-nine to eighteen. Mr. Seward's remarks on the subject, during its discussion, were eloquent and timely.

After the wires had been laid between the coast of Ireland and Newfoundland, there was a spontaneous gathering of people in Auburn, as in many other places, to rejoice over the happy event. Mr. Seward, and Governor King, who was then on a visit to Auburn, delivered enthusiastic and eloquent speeches. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Seward related the following incidents in the passage of the telegraph bill through congress:

"Cyrus W. Field, by assiduity and patience, first secured consent and conditional engagement on the part of Great Britain, and then, less than two years ago, repaired to Washington. The president and secretary of state individually favored his proposition, but the jealousies of parties and sections in congress forbade them to lend it their efficient aid and sanction. He appealed to me. I drew the necessary bill. With the generous aid of others, northern representatives, and the indispensable aid of the late Thomas J. Rusk, a senator from Texas, that bill, after a severe contest, was carried through the senate of the United States by a bare majority. It escaped defeat in the house of representatives with equal difficulty. I have said the aid of Mr. Rusk was indispensable. If any one has wondered why I, an extreme northern man, loved and lamented Thomas J. Rusk, an equally extreme southern man, they have here an explanation. There was no good thing which, as it seemed to me, I could not do in congress with his aid. When he died, it seemed to me that no good thing could be done by any one.

1 On the death of Senator Rusk, Mr. Seward delivered an eloquent eulogium on his life and services.

"But so vehement were the prejudices against Mr. Field for what was then regarded as presumption and officiousness on his part, although he is the most modest of all men, that the great bill was only saved by his withdrawing at the request of Mr. Rusk and myself from the senate chamber, its lobbies and even from the capitol grounds, and remaining unobtrusive and unseen in his own lodgings. But Cyrus W. Field, at last, fortified with capital derived from New York and London, and with the navies of Great Britain and the United States at his command, has after trials that would have discouraged any other than a true discoverer, brought the great work to a felicitous consummation."

General rejoicing spread over the country upon the announcement that the cable was laid and that messages between the two worlds had actually been transmitted. Mr. Seward's services, in securing the aid of the government to the project, were everywhere remembered, and will be still more cordially acknowledged when the communication shall be again established.

Mr. Seward supported with equal zeal, in the senate, the project of a line of telegraphs to the Pacific ocean, connecting California and Oregon with the Atlantic seaboard.[1]

Near the close of the session, amendments were proposed to the existing tariff laws. Mr. Seward opposed them as still further embarrassing the interests of the iron manufacturers and the wool growers of this country. The amendments proposed in the senate by Mr. Hunter were adopted, ayes thirty-three, nays twelve, viz., Messrs. Bell, Bigler, Brodhead, Collamer, Durkee, Foot, Geyer, Nourse, Seward, Thompson, Trumbull and Wade. The senate and house disagreeing, a committee of conference, of which Mr. Seward was one, reported a series of amendments, which were less detrimental to American interests. Their report was concurred in by both houses; in the senate by thirty-three to eight; in the house by one hundred and twenty-three to seventy-two.

A bill which proposed to restore peace in Kansas by annulling all laws of disputed validity and enabling the people of the terri-

1 The following correspondence is copied from the St. Paul Times of August 30th, 1860:

"The despatches below are the first ever sent over the wire in due form, and it is eminently proper that this inaugural dispatch should have been transmitted to and by Wm. H. Seward."

To Gov. Seward, Auburn, N. Y.

ST. PAUL, Aug. 29, 1:45 P. M.—Through the courtesy of Mr. Winslow, proprietor, we are enabled to send this the first dispatch ever transmitted by lightning from St. Paul to the east, as complimentary to you. (Signed) M. S. WILKINSON, AARON GOODRICH.

Senator Seward's Reply.

AUBURN, Aug. 29, 8:30, P. M.—To M. S. Wilkinson and A. Goodrich: You have grappled New York, now lay hold on San Francisco. (Signed) WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

tory to establish a government for themselves, passed the house on the 17th of February, by a vote of ninety-eight to seventy-nine. In the senate it was laid on the table, ayes thirty, nays twenty; Messrs. Bell, Brodhead, Houston, James, Pugh and Stuart voting in the negative with the republicans.

Mr. Seward's speeches, during the session, on the admission of Minnesota, the Indiana senators, post office appropriations, and other measures were practical and effective.

On the 4th of March, 1857, Mr. Buchanan became president of the United States. His inaugural address abounded with plausible professions of devotion to the public welfare. He especially deprecated the further agitation of the slavery question, although a large portion of his remarks were upon that subject. He expressed himself in favor of the admission of Kansas into the Union with a constitution approved by a majority of the voters in the territory. He alluded also to a decision of the supreme court, soon to be made, counseling acquiesence in it, whatever might be its character and effect.

A special session of the senate was called to consider the nominations of the new president. Several subjects of interest were considered in open session. The committees were reorganized after some opposition from several senators in the minority, who deemed the composition of the committees unequal and unfair. Mr. Seward remarked that he had been in the senate when no place was allowed to him or his political associates on any committee. He did not then complain. He thought he best served the country by foregoing all personal considerations on such questions. He preferred to leave it to the people to substitute for this majority a better majority.[1]

Scarcely had the echo of the president's inaugural speech died away when[2] the supreme court rendered its decision in the "Dred Scott case." Its announcement produced a profound sensation throughout the country, and awakened a feeling of indignation that has not yet subsided. This was the decision to which the president had referred, in his inaugural address, and to which the people were expected to submit. The case is briefly as follows: an action was commenced in the circuit court of the United States, for the district

1 Mr. Seward was placed on the committee of foreign relations; Mr. King on pensions; Messrs. Sumner and Wade on territories, and two republicans on most of the other committees.
2 March 6th, 1857.

of Missouri, in 1854, by Dred Scott, to establish his freedom, and that of his wife and their two daughters, who were claimed and held as slaves by one Sanford, the defendant. Sanford placed his defense on two grounds: *First*, that Dred Scott was not a citizen of Missouri because he was a negro of African descent; and, *second*, that Dred and his family were the defendant's slaves. Scott relied on facts mutually admitted—that he was formerly a slave in Missouri; was taken in 1834, by his then master, to Illinois, and held there in servitude two years, and was thence taken to the territory west of the Mississippi, and north of the Missouri compromise line, where he was also held in servitude until the year 1838, when he was brought back to the state of Missouri and sold as a slave to the defendant before this suit was commenced.

The circuit court decided in Scott's favor as to the jurisdiction of the court, but against him on the question of his freedom. He then appealed to the supreme court. His case was twice elaborately argued before that tribunal. The court decided substantially that, Dred Scott was not a citizen, and for that reason the courts of the United States had no jurisdiction in the case; and expressed the opinion that free colored persons whose ancestors were imported into this country and sold as slaves, "had no rights which the white man was bound to respect," and were not citizens of the United States; that there is no difference between property in a slave and other property; that congress has no power to prohibit slavery in the territories; that the Missouri compromise act was unconstitutional and void; and that the taking of a slave, by his master, into a free state or a territory does not entitle the slave to his freedom.[1] Two judges, Messrs. McLean and Curtis, dissented from the majority of the court in their decision and opinions.

The people of the free states, greatly shocked by the action of the supreme court, gave expression to their feelings in various ways. The legislature of the state of New York passed resolutions declaring that the supreme court of the United States, by its action in this matter, "has impaired the confidence and respect of the people of this state"; and that "this state will not allow slavery within her borders, in any form, or under any pretence, or for any time."

1 Of this decision an eminent advocate of New York, Wm. M. Evarts, Esq., remarked in a public address, that if it had been rendered before the presidential election of 1856, no democrat would have succeeded; and that if Mr. Buchanan had not been chosen the opinions never would have seen the light.

Mr. Seward took occasion, in the senate, in his speech[1] on the admission of Kansas, to review the decision, and the connection of the president with its announcement. His dramatic description, in this speech, of the inauguration ceremonies; his vivid exhibition of the insincerity of the president's professions; and his clear exposition of the fatal connection of the decision with the tyrannies and outrages in Kansas, arrested the attention of the senate and the country

At a subsequent date he proposed a reconstruction of the supreme court and the courts of the United States, "so that the states shall be represented by judges in said courts more nearly on the basis of their federal population, while the administration of justice shall be made more speedy and efficient." These amendments he proposed to make in accordance with the letter and spirit of the constitution, without injustice to any interest or section of the Union.

The thirty-fifth congress, elected mainly at the same time with Mr. Buchanan, commenced its first session on the 7th of December, 1857. The administration, like that which preceded it, claimed a decisive majority in both houses. In the senate there were thirty-seven democrats, twenty republicans, and five whigs or Americans. The house stood—democrats one hundred and twenty-eight, republicans ninety-two, Americans fourteen. Mr. Seward's speeches at this session were numerous, and on a great variety of subjects.[2]

Early in the autumn of 1857, signs of a severe and general revulsion in the trade and industry of the country began to appear. During the month of October all the banks suspended specie payments, and a most alarming prostration of business ensued. More than five thousand failures occurred, involving liabilities to the amount of three hundred millions of dollars. The winter opened with a universal complaint of distress, especially among the working classes in the cities and large towns. Probably no interest was more seriously impaired than railroad stocks. In the short space of thirty days, shares in many of the leading corporations depreciated more than fifty per cent, becoming, in some instances, valueless. The treasury

[1] March 3, 1858. See present volume.

[2] The following are the titles, as given in the *Congressional Globe:* The President's Message; Eulogy on James Bell; Treasury Notes; William Walker; Paying for Slaves out of the Treasury; Eulogy on Thomas J. Rusk; Increase of the Army; Admission of Minnesota; Kansas and Lecompton; Slavery in New York; Pacific Railroad; Admission of Oregon; The Fisheries; British Aggressions; Rivers and Harbors; Coast Survey; Eulogy on the late Senator Henderson; Mail Steamers; and Washington City Schools.

of the United States, which, a short time ago, was overflowing, was now suffering from depletion, and immediate legislation was required to meet the wants of the government.

Among the first acts of the president, after the assembling of congress, was to call for an issue of treasury notes. Mr. Seward, while admitting the necessity of such means of relief, proposed to limit the issue, in amount, rate of interest, and length of time.

In a speech, already noticed, made by Mr. Seward, in February, 1853, on removing the duties from railroad iron,[1] a prophetic warning of the present embarrassments may be found. His statesmanlike counsels had been unheeded, and seven years had been sufficient to consummate his predictions.

The people of Kansas saw no improvement in their affairs under the administration of Mr. Buchanan. President Pierce had removed from office, two governors of Kansas, Reeder and Shannon, because they had manifested an unwillingness to submit wholly and unreservedly to the pro-slavery party in the territory. John W. Geary succeeded Governor Shannon, and was soon compelled, by persecution in Kansas and neglect at Washington, to resign. President Buchanan then appointed Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi, to succeed Mr. Geary. Mr. Walker also resigned, after striving for a few months, without success, to administer the government of the territory with some degree of justice to the people, without, at the same time, offending the administration at Washington. F. P. Stanton, the secretary of the territory, who acted as governor during the absence of Walker, encountered the displeasure of the pro-slavery party, and was removed from office by the president. Governor Walker and Mr. Stanton, like their predecessors, failed to secure either order or fairness in the elections or government of Kansas; and the people were forced to submit to the usurpations of their oppressors. A legislature, composed of pro-slavery members, assembled at Lecompton, in January, 1857, and ordered a convention to be called to frame a state constitution. The legislature and the convention were thus both placed in the hands of the enemies of Kansas, having been chosen almost entirely by fraudulent votes.

[1] See p. 623, vol. III.

By the act calling this convention, a census of voters was to be taken, on the basis of which, previous to the choice of delegates, an apportionment was to be made. This census, falling into the hands of the pro-slavery sheriffs, was grossly unjust, most of the free state voters being unenumerated, and some counties entirely omitted. The apportionment and all the arrangments for the election of delegates were made, so as to perfectly ensure the return of a pro-slavery majority in the convention. Under these circumstances the free state men again refused to vote and the whole number of votes cast was only about two thousand.

The election took place on the 15th of June, and the delegates thus chosen met in convention at Lecompton on the 4th of September, 1857.[1] After organizing they adjourned until October. In the meantime an election for members to the territorial legislature was held, in which the free state men participated, some show of fairness having been secured. The result of this election, notwithstanding many gross attempts at fraud, secured a legislature of thirty-six free state members to sixteen pro-slavery. The free state delegate to congress was chosen at the same time by seven thousand six hundred votes, against three thousand seven hundred for the pro-slavery candidate, showing the free state settlers to be in a large majority in the territory.

[1] Since the above was written, Governor Walker, himself, has testified to the following facts: "Shortly after I arrived at Lecompton," says Mr. Walker, "the county of Douglas, of which Lecompton is the capital, held a democratic meeting, and nominated eight gentlemen, I think, as delegates to the Lecompton convention, of which John Calhoun, then the surveyor-general of the territory, was at the head. The resolutions of the meeting required them to sustain the submission of the constitution to the vote of the people. They published a written pledge to that effect. Rumors were circulated by their opponents that they would not submit the whole constitution to the people. They published a second circular, a day or two before the election, denouncing these rumors as falsehoods, and reaffirming their determination, if elected, to submit the constitution to the people. But for these assurances it is universally conceded they had no chance whatever of being elected—not the slightest.

"I still continued to entertain not the shadow of a doubt that the constitution would be submitted to a vote of the people by the convention, nor do I believe the slightest doubt existed in the territory. I deem it due to frankness to say, that from my long residence in the south, and my general views on the subject of slavery, I should have greatly preferred that a majority of the people of Kansas would have made it a slave state. I avowed these views very fully in my public communications in Kansas. I never disguised my opinions upon this subject. But at the same time it was perfectly obvious to myself and to every person that it was possible to accomplish that object by no fair means in Kansas. I was determined that, so far as my action was concerned, there should be a fair vote of the people, and that I would countenance no frauds, or forgeries, or villainy of any kind, in connection with a question so solemn as that. This attempt to make Kansas a slave state developed itself in the fall of 1857. It first was fully developed by the terrible forgeries in the pretended returns. They were not legal returns that were sent to me as governor of the territory, and which I rejected, although that rejection gave a majority of the territorial legislature to my political opponents, the republicans. The first forgery presented to me was the case at Oxford, which was a forgery upon its face, and that it was so has since been acknowledged by one of the judges whose names were signed to it. In a public document he declares that he never did affix his signature to it. In Oxford, some sixteen hundred votes were attempted to be given in a village of six houses, where there were not fifty voters, and it is now ascertained that not thirty votes were really given. The rest were all forgeries.

"The next return presented was from McGee county, where there certainly were not twenty voters, but which was returned as over twelve hundred voters, given at three different precincts, and where it is now ascertained that there was no election holden at all—not a vote given."

The convention reassembled at Lecompton, and framed a constitution recognizing slavery and declaring the right of property in slaves to be higher than any law or constitution. Notwithstanding the members had pledged themselves to submit the constitution they were to frame, to the suffrages of the people, no such provision was adopted by the convention. Only the section relating to slavery was to be so submitted, and it was by an artful precaution made impossible to vote for or against that section without, at the same time, voting *for* the whole constitution. The free state settlers refusing to vote, the slavery permission was adopted by a vote of six thousand one hundred forty-three to five hundred and sixty-nine. Three-fourths of the affirmative votes were proved to be fraudulent.

Early in February, 1858, the president sent to congress a special message, with the constitution thus formed at Lecompton, recommending the admission of Kansas into the Union under that constitution. In the house the subject was referred to a select committee, on motion of Mr. Harris, of Illinois, by a vote of one hundred and fourteen to one hundred and eleven. The speaker, contrary to usage, appointed a committee opposed to the object of the mover.

In the senate, after a debate of several weeks duration, a bill was passed to admit Kansas under the Lecompton constitution; ayes thirty-three, nays twenty-five. Bell, Broderick, Crittenden, Douglas, Pugh and Stuart voted nay with the republicans. Previous to the final passage of the bill Mr. Crittenden moved a substitute providing that the Lecompton constitution should be submitted to the people of Kansas; if approved, the president should by proclamation admit Kansas into the Union; if rejected by the people, a new convention might be called to frame another constitution. Mr. Crittenden's substitute was rejected in the senate by a vote of twenty-four to thirty-two—Bell, Broderick, Douglas and Stuart voting aye with the republicans.

The bill as it passed the senate was taken up in the house on the first day of April. A motion to reject it was lost—ayes ninety-five, nays one hundred and thirty-seven. Besides the republicans voting to reject the bill were Harris, of Illinois, and Hickman, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Montgomery, of Pennsylvania, immediately moved to substitute Mr. Crittenden's amendment for the senate bill. His motion was carried, and the house, by a vote of one hundred

and twenty to one hundred and twelve, adopted, substantially, the bill offered as a substitute in the senate by Mr. Crittenden.[1]

The bill, thus amended, was returned to the senate, where it was rejected by thirty-four to twenty-two. The house for several days maintained its position and refused to recede. The senate, equally obstinate, at length proposed a conference. The house, after one day's deliberation, by the close vote of one hundred and nine to one hundred and eight, accepted the proposition, and a conference committee was appointed—Green, Hunter and Seward, of the senate, with English, Stephens and Howard, of the house. Mr. English, who had voted in the house for the substitute, was the chairman. On the 23d of April, he reported to the house a compromise, Seward and Howard dissenting. This compromising bill of which Mr. English was the reputed author, was prevaricating and double dealing in its terms, and a virtual surrender of the principle contained in Mr. Crittenden's substitute, which the house had just adopted by eight majority. While professing to submit the constitution to the people of Kansas, the bill provided that in case of an adverse vote, the territory should not be admitted until it contained ninety-three thousand three hundred and forty inhabitants, and also that it should thereby forfeit its right to large allotments of the public lands heretofore set apart for internal improvement and education in the territory. It nevertheless passed the house by one hundred and twelve to one hundred and three,[2] and the senate by thirty to twenty-two, Broderick, Crittenden, Douglas and Stuart persisting in their opposition. It was promptly signed by the president, and under its provisions the constitution was submitted to the people of Kansas. They rejected it by a large majority, only one thousand seven hundred and eighty-eight voting in its favor and eleven thousand three hundred against it. Mr. Seward's speeches during this contest in the senate, are remarkable for their ability and comprehensive views. They trace with historical accuracy and striking effect the various acts of the pro-slavery party,

1 The democrats who voted for the "Crittenden amendment," as it was called, were Messrs. McKibbin of California; Morris, Harris, Shaw, Smith and Marshall, of Illinois; English, Foley and Davis, of Indiana; Adrian, of New Jersey; Haskin and Clark, of New York; Pendleton, Groesbeck, Cockerill, Hall, Lawrence and Cox, of Ohio; Jones, Hickman, Montgomery and Chapman, of Pennsylvania. Messrs. Underwood, Marshall, Davis, Ricaud, Harris and Gilmer, representatives of slaveholding states, also voted with the republicans.

2 Among those who receded from their former positions were Messrs. English, Foley, Gilmer, Cockerill, Cox, Groesbeck, Hall, Lawrence, Pendleton and Jones.

in congress and in Kansas, in its persevering efforts to establish slavery in that territory.

During the session, Mr. Seward advocated and voted for the admission of Oregon and Minnesota into the Union. He, at the same time, opposed the proscriptive features contained in the constitution of Oregon, and protested against any indorsement of the prejudice on which the proscriptions rested. Minnesota was admitted, but the bill for the admission of Oregon, after passing the senate, failed in the house of representatives.

One of the most remarkable pages in the history of Mr. Buchanan's administration will be that which relates to his management of affairs in the territory of Utah. Having formally removed Brigham Young from the office of governor and appointed Alfred Cumming as his successor, the president determined to send a body of troops to Utah with the new governor, to act as his *posse comitatus*. This little army, only three hundred strong, with a train of wagons six miles in length, started on its long and dangerous march in the autumn of 1857. During its tedious journey the train was attacked by the Indians on the route, robbed of its cattle, overtaken by Siberian snows and despoiled of a large portion of its supplies. Five hundred of its animals died in one night of cold and hunger, and fifty wagons were captured and burned by emissaries of Brigham Young. After repeated hardships, and losses amounting to millions of dollars, the train reduced to a fragment of its original proportions, arrived within one hundred miles of Salt Lake city and there went into winter quarters. A serious abridgment of rations was necessary to save the army from starvation. Brigham Young resolutely forbade the entrance of Governor Cumming and his forces into the city, and it was only by a mortifying submission that they were allowed to remain in their encampment without destruction. Thus, for several months, the rebellious people of Utah were suffered to harass and destroy the army of the United States and put its authority at defiance. Fortunately for humanity, an actual conflict was avoided by the interposition of a private gentleman of influence and practical benevolence.[1] The dishonor of the administration's conduct, however, remains. A bill, introduced in the senate, increasing

1 Thomas L. Kane, of Pennsylvania.

the army of the United States in view of the then threatened rebellion in Utah, was debated at much length and with great vigor.

Mr. Seward, with that patriotic regard for the honor of his country which characterizes all his acts and speeches, supported the bill and advocated the most efficient measures for suppressing the rebellion and restoring the supremacy of law and order. His speeches on the subject in the senate created not a little excitement in that body and among the people. In this instance as in others he did not hesitate, in view of all the circumstances, to separate himself, for the time, from some of his political friends. He believed it to be his duty to sustain the honor and dignity of the government even if he thereby gave aid and comfort to Mr. Buchanan's administration. And already it is generally conceded that Mr. Seward, in merging the partizan in the patriot, has strengthened his position before the country as a statesman.

An adventurer, named William Walker, during President Pierce's administration, made several expeditions, in violation of our neutrality laws, to the Central American States on the isthmus, with the evident design of revolutionizing their governments and preparing the way for their becoming slaveholding states. President Buchanan, like his predecessor, made a show of preventing these marauding expeditions, and Walker was repeatedly arrested; but his schemes seemed never to be thwarted.

On the 24th of November, 1857, he landed, with four hundred men, on the shores of Nicaragua, at Greytown, in full view of an armed vessel sent there by our government to watch and intercept him. Commodore Paulding, who was in the vicinity, knowing the unlawful nature of Walker's enterprises, soon arrested him and sent him back to the United States, a prisoner. Walker was subsequently indicted and tried at New Orleans, but the jury failed to agree, and the prosecution was abandoned. Commodore Paulding, on the other hand, was treated with marked coldness by the administration, and resolutions were introduced in the senate and in the house, by the president's friends, condemning his course. Mr. Seward defended the arrest, and supported a resolution to present Commodore Paulding with a gold medal.

The first session of the thirty-fifth congress was brought to a close on the 16th of June, 1858.

After the adjournment, Mr. Seward was engaged for several weeks in the circuit court of the United States at New York. His argument before that court, in favor of a bridge over the Hudson river at Albany, is remarkable for its originality and for its extensive knowledge of the subject of navigation.

The elections in the autumn of 1858 resulted in a decided rebuke of the president and his Kansas-Lecompton policy. In the state of New York, only four members of congress favoring that policy were elected; and the republican candidate for governor (Hon. E. D. Morgan) was chosen by nearly twenty thousand majority. The struggle in the state was nevertheless severe, and the result seemed to many to be doubtful. In this emergency, Mr. Seward appeared before the people, and by his speeches at Rochester, Rome, and Auburn, rallied the strength of the republicans, and at the same time destroyed the hopes of the opposition. His speech at Rochester, especially, gave a new aspect to the contest, and turned the tide in favor of the republican party. The following passage has acquired an enduring fame:

"Hitherto, the two systems (slave and free labor) have existed in different states, but side by side, within the American Union. This has happened because the Union is a confederation of states. But, in another aspect, the United States constitute only one nation. Increase of population, which is filling the states out to their very borders, together with a new and extended net-work of railroads and other avenues, and an internal commerce which daily becomes more intimate, are rapidly bringing the states into a higher and more perfect social unity or consolidation. Thus these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results.

"Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free states, and it is the existence of thiis great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, vain and ephemeral. Startling as this saying may appear to you, fellow citizens, it is by no

means an original or even a modern one. Our forefathers knew it to be true, and unanimously acted upon it when they framed the constitution of the United States. They regarded the existence of the servile system in so many of the states with sorrow and shame, which they openly confessed, and they looked upon the collision between them, which was then just revealing itself, and which we are now accustomed to deplore, with favor and hope. They knew that either the one or the other system must exclusively prevail.

"It remains to say on this point only one word, to guard against misapprehension. If these states are to again become universally slaveholding, I do not pretend to say with what violations of the constitution that end shall be accomplished. On the other hand, while I do confidently believe and hope that my country will yet become a land of universal freedom, I do not expect that it will be made so otherwise than through the action of the several states co-operating with the federal government, and all acting in strict conformity with their respective constitutions.

"The strife and contentions concerning slavery, which gently-disposed persons so habitually deprecate, are nothing more than the ripening of the conflict which the fathers themselves not only thus regarded with favor, but which they may be said to have instituted."

Congress again assembled on the first Monday in December, 1858. On the first day of the session, Mr. Mason, of Virginia, in the senate, called up the bill to indemnify the owners of the Spanish schooner Amistead for the loss of its cargo of slaves. Mr. Seward remarked that he did not consider it a meritorious bill, and moved a postponement of its consideration. The subject was suffered to rest during the remainder of the thirty-fifth congress.

Mr. Seward's speeches during the session were upon the Pacific railroad bill; the expenses and revenues of government; the bill to facilitate the acquisition of Cuba; the Indiana senatorial question; the consular and diplomatic appropriations; the homestead bill; the protection of American citizens abroad; and the post office, civil and naval appropriations. In the discussion of one of the latter bills, the affairs of Kansas were briefly alluded to by Mr. Seward. He expressed his satisfaction with the prospect that Kansas was soon to be admitted into the Union as a free state; and hailed the approach of the time when no successful attempt would be made in congress to bind down any future territory to come into the Union as a slaveholding state.

In the debate on the Pacific railroad bill, Mr. Seward advocated an amendment providing that preference should be given, in the

construction of the road, to iron of American manufacture. He gave his assent to the route proposed by the committee, although he preferred one less southern. He discarded the policy of giving the public lands to a company to build the road, preferring that the land in its vicinity should be surrendered to actual settlers, so as to secure the speediest possible production of revenue from it. He would directly employ the capital and credit of the United States, increasing the tariff on foreign importations for the purpose of defraying the cost and providing a sinking fund for the extinguishment of the debt created in the construction of the road. These views are very ably set forth in his speeches, with many practical suggestions, most of which were incorporated into the bill prepared by the committee.

Mr. Seward, in discussing the act making appropriations for the civil and diplomatic service of the United States, urged several important reforms in both departments. He believed that greater economy might be secured in their administration, without impairing their efficiency. He named a number of foreign missions that might be combined, and several that might be safely abolished.

Probably no more important subject occupied the attention of congress than that of the disposition of the public lands. "A bill to secure homesteads to actual settlers on the public domain" passed the house, one hundred and twenty to seventy-six. The republicans voted for the measure. Six northern democrats voted against, and only three southern members for it. Of the democratic votes in the house, a large majority were cast against the bill. It having thus passed the house, early in February, 1859, Mr. Wade, in the senate, on the 17th of that month, moved to take it up. His motion prevailed.[1]

All that was now desired by the friends of the bill was a vote upon its final passage, which its opponents were determined to prevent. Mr. Seward, in brief but energetic terms, urged its friends to stand firm and insist upon its consideration. But after a desultory debate, which Senator Mason threatened should be "extended," a motion to lay aside the bill was carried by the casting vote of the vice-president. During the contest, Mr. Gwin left the friends of the bill and voted with its enemies. As in the house, a large majority of the

[1] The vote stood as follows (republicans in *italics*): *Yeas*—Messrs. Bright, Broderick, *Chandler*, *Collamer*, *Dixon*, *Doolittle*, *Fessenden*, *Foot*, *Foster*, Gwin, *Hale*, *Hamlin*, *Harlan*, Johnson of Tennessee, *King*, Pugh, Rice, *Seward*, Shields, *Simmons*, Smith, Stuart, *Trumbull*, *Wade*, and *Wilson*—26. *Nays*—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Benjamin, Bigler, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Hammond, Hunter, Iverson, Lane, Mallory, Mason, Pearce, Reid, Slidell, Toombs, and Ward—23.

democrats voted against the bill, while every republican sustained it, at every stage. Two days afterwards, Mr. Wade again called up the bill; but a motion to take up the Cuba bill, instead, prevailed.[1] This was again repeated on the 25th of February. After a debate on the Cuba project, protracted late into the night, another effort was made to consider the homestead bill. Mr. Seward remarked:

"After nine hours' yielding to the discussion of the Cuba question, it is time to come back to the great question of the day and the age. The senate may as well meet, face to face, the issue which is before them. It is an issue presented by the competition between these two questions. One, the homestead bill, is a question of homes, of lands for the landless freemen of the United States. The Cuba bill is the question of slaves for the slaveholders of the United States."

All efforts, however, to lay aside the Cuba bill were ineffectual, and no other opportunity occurred before the adjournment of Congress to get a vote on the final passage of one of the most beneficent measures ever presented to any legislative body. In the senate and in the house of representatives the republicans voted steadily on the side of the measure, while the democrats, with a few exceptions, were as uniformly against it. Mr. Seward's speech in favor of a homestead law, delivered in the senate as early as 1851, is an elaborate defense of the measure, and may be referred to as the best exposition of the subject ever made in the senate.[2]

The legislature of Indiana, in 1857, attempted to elect two United States senators. The two branches were of opposite politics. The senate consisted of twenty-three democrats and twenty-seven opposition, while the house numbered sixty-three democrats to thirty-seven opposition. No law existing in that state prescribing the manner of electing a senator, the constitution of the United States was the only guide in the matter. That instrument declares, that senators shall be elected by the "legislature." The laws of Indiana define the legislature to be "the senate *and* house." The senate consists of fifty members; the house of one hundred. Two-thirds, in each, is required to make a quorum.

[1] The following is the vote to give the Cuba bill priority of consideration: *Yeas*—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Bell, Benjamin, Bigler, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hammond, Houston, Hunter, Iverson, Jones, Lane Mallory, Mason, Polk, Pugh, Reid, Rice, Sebastian, Shields, Slidell, Smith, Stuart, Toombs, Ward, Wright, and Yulee—23. *Nays*—Messrs. Broderick, *Cameron*, *Chandler*, *Clark*, *Collamer*, *Dixon*, *Doolittle*, Douglas, *Durkee*, *Fessenden*, *Foot*, *Foster*, *Hale*, *Hamlin*, *Harlan*, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, *King*, Pearce, *Seward*, *Simmons*, *Trumbull*, *Wade*, and *Wilson*—24.

[2] See vol. I, p. 156.

The house, with twenty-three senators, on the 4th of February, in a pretended joint convention, elected Messrs. Bright and Fitch senators of the United States; the latter to fill the vacancy then existing, and the former for the full term, commencing the ensuing 4th of March. This election was deemed invalid for the following reasons—the senate had never voted for this joint convention, but on the other hand had adopted a protest, twenty-seven to twenty, against any such meeting, a few days before it was held. Less than a quorum of the house were present, and there were several other gross informalities attending the pretended election, sufficient to render it palpably illegal and void. Twenty-seven senators and thirty-six representatives sent a protest to the United States senate, declaring that a quorum of neither house had participated in the election; that the alleged joint convention was unauthorized by any law of the state, by any resolution of the legislature, or by any provision of the constitution of Indiana, or of the United States; and that to affirm its action would destroy the existence of the senate of Indiana as a branch of the legislature.[1] But a majority of the senate of the United States allowed Messrs. Bright and Fitch to take their seats and act as members of the senate.

In 1859 the legislature of Indiana, in a legal and formal manner, chose Messrs. Henry S. Lane and William Monroe McCarty, as senators, to take the places illegally held by Messrs. Bright and Fitch. One argument at the previous session of congress had been that no contestants appeared for the seats claimed by the latter gentlemen. Messrs. Lane and McCarty accordingly presented their credentials to the senate by the hands of the vice-president, with a memorial from the legislature of Indiana reciting the facts in the case.

Mr. Seward moved that the recently elected senators be allowed the privileges of the senate until their claims were considered and decided. His speech in vindication of their rights, and in condemnation of the usurpations and action of the legislature of Indiana in 1857, is a well reasoned and cogent argument of the whole question.

The senate, however, refused to adopt Mr. Seward's motion allowing Messrs. McCarty and Lane the privileges of the floor; and also

1 Certain state officers are also, by the constitution and laws of Indiana, required to be elected by a joint convention. But, although several vacancies had existed for some time, the members composing the convention which elected the two senators, did not dare to assume the duty of electing such officers at that or at any convention similarly constituted.

declined to consider their claims, on the ground that the question had been closed by previous action of the senate.

On the 24th of January, 1857, Mr. Slidell, of Louisiana, from the committee on foreign relations, reported to the senate a bill for the acquisition of the island of Cuba. The project had been ushered into the senate by a special message from the president and was considered an Executive measure. It provided for the immediate appropriation of thirty millions of dollars, to be placed under the control of the president, to be used in his discretion for the acquisition of the island, without requiring the ratification by the senate of any treaty he might make. Neither was the president limited in the amount to be paid, ultimately—the thirty millions of dollars being for the preliminary arrangements to the actual purchase. Mr. Seward's views in regard to the acquisition of Cuba were expressed in his speech in the senate on the 26th of January, 1853, as follows:

"While I do not desire the immediate or early annexation of Cuba, nor see how I could vote for it at all until slavery shall have ceased to counteract the workings of nature in that beautiful island, nor even then, unless it could come into the Union without injustice to Spain, without aggressive war, and without producing internal dissensions among ourselves, I nevertheless yield my full acquiescence to the views of John Quincy Adams, that this nation can never safely allow that island to pass under the dominion of any power that is already, or can become, a formidable rival or enemy."[1]

The bill now before the senate met with Mr. Seward's persistent opposition. His speeches and remarks during the debate were full of warning and denunciation of the dangerous provisions contained in the bill. It also encountered the opposition of the other republican senators, and was finally dropped by its friends, without a vote being taken on its passage. A motion to lay the bill on the table was made in the senate at midnight on the 25th of February, which was lost, eighteen to thirty. This was the last action had upon the measure during the session.

By the 10th section of an act passed March 3d, 1857, congress provided for the establishment of an overland mail to San Francisco in these words:

"SEC. 10. *And be it further enacted*, That the postmaster-general be, and he is hereby, authorized to contract for the conveyance of the entire letter mail, from

1 See Vol. III, page 605.

such point on the Mississippi river as the contractors may select, to San Francisco, in the state of California, for six years, at a cost not exceeding three hundred thousand dollars per annum for semi-monthly, four hundred and fifty thousand dollars for weekly, or six hundred thousand dollars for semi-weekly service; to be performed semi-monthly, weekly or semi-weekly, at the option of the postmaster-general."

The bids made for this contract specified the route to be traversed as it was contemplated they should, by the act. But none of the routes proposed were sufficiently southern to satisfy the president and his cabinet. By an extraordinary exercise of power the successful contractors were made to adopt a route agreed upon by the administration and its southern advisers, described as follows:

"From St. Louis, Missouri, and from Memphis, Tennessee, converging at Little Rock, Arkansas; thence, via Preston, Texas, or as nearly so as may be found advisable, to the best point of crossing the Rio Grande, above El Paso, and not far from Fort Fillmore; thence along the new road, being opened and constructed under the direction of the secretary of the interior, to Fort Yumas, California; thence through the best passes and along the best valleys for safe and expeditious staging, to San Francisco."

One of the objects in compelling the contractors to take this extremely southern and circuitous route seems to have been to favor the gulf states and to populate with immigrants the territory of Arizona, at the expense of the more central and northern portions of the country. An effort was made in congress in February, 1859, to change the action of the post office department in regard to this matter, and to restore the spirit and letter of the act of March 3d, 1857. The route forced upon the contractors neither accommodated the transmission of letters nor the conveyance of passengers from the Mississippi river to San Francisco, while it involved an expense of over six hundred thousand dollars. On the 1st of March, 1859, an amendment to the post office appropriation bill was lost, as follows:

"*And be it further enacted*, That the contract with Butterfield & Co., for carrying the mails from the Mississippi river to San Francisco, in California, shall be so construed as to allow said contractors to carry the mail by any route they may select."

YEAS—Messrs. Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Foot, Foster Harlan, King, Polk, Pugh, Seward, Shields, Simmons, Trumbull, Wade and Wilson—20. NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Bell, Benjamin, Bigler, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Crittenden, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin,

Hammond, Houston, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Jones, Lane, Mason, Pearce, Reid, Rice, Slidell, Stuart, Toombs, Ward and Yulee—30.

It will be seen that this vote was almost entirely sectional, Mr. Polk of Missouri being the only senator from a slave state in the affirmative.

Further efforts were made in the senate and in the house by Mr. Seward and others, to give to the north and west a just and equitable share in the advantages to be derived from an overland mail route to the Pacific. One provision of this character, adopted by congress, was defeated by the president's refusing to sign the bill containing it, and another was lost with the post office appropriation bill to which it was attached.

Mr. Seward advocated the most practicable measures that came before the senate for affording mail facilities to the people living between the Mississippi river and the Pacific ocean. In the same spirit he favored the best attainable projects for a railroad, and a line of telegraphs, through the same territory. No sectional prejudices mar any of his speeches on these great subjects nor appear in any of the votes he cast.

A bill giving to the several states portions of the public lands for the support of colleges devoted specially to agricultural and mechanical sciences, having passed the house at the previous session, came up in the senate and was passed: ayes twenty-five, nays twenty-two. It was vetoed by the president. Mr. Seward with other republican senators zealously supported this bill while the negative votes were cast entirely by democrats.

The efforts of the administration to increase the rates of postage on letters were opposed by Mr. Seward, and by the republicans in the senate and house of representatives, and were finally defeated.

On the 3d of March, 1859, the thirty-fifth congress adjourned *sine die*. The president immediately called an extra session of the senate to meet at noon on the next day. After a week spent chiefly in executive sessions the senate again adjourned.

After the adjournment of the senate (March 10, 1859), Mr. Seward determined to gratify his long-cherished desire for an extensive foreign tour. He had made a brief and hurried visit to Europe in 1833, in company with his father. He designed now to make a more pro

tracted stay in the countries he then visited, and to examine more thoroughly into the condition of their inhabitants and the working of their governments; and also to extend his journey into Asia and Africa.

He accordingly sailed from New York on the 7th of May, in the steamship Ariel. His departure was, unexpectedly to him, made a public event. He was waited upon at the Astor House by the two republican central committees, and, after a brief interchange of compliments, the committees, with their guest, proceeded in carriages to Castle Garden, where they were received by several hundred republicans, and escorted on board the steamer which was waiting to convey the party down the bay. A salute was fired, and the band played "Hail to the Chief," while the boat left the wharf, amid hearty cheers from men on board and on shore.

On parting with his company at the Narrows, Mr. Seward addressed them as follows:

"GENTLEMEN: It would of course be impossible for me to persuade you that anybody could be insensible to the manifestations of such hospitality as I am receiving at your hands. I will, with your leave, however, undertake to interpret it, leaving out all its political bearings and relations, and will regard you, not as politicians, not as republicans, but as fellow citizens and as friends who, against my will, followed me to the house of my friends, where I was entertained, took me up at the door of my hotel, unwilling to leave me alone in your city, and who will not part from me now until you separate from me at the gates of the ocean. Gentlemen, the sky is bright, the sun is auspicious; all the indications promise a pleasant and prosperous voyage, and it will depend upon my own temper whether out of it I am able or not to make the material for which I go abroad—the knowledge derived from the sufferings and strivings of humanity in foreign countries—to teach me how to improve and elevate the condition of my own countrymen. I will only say, gentlemen, in expressing my thanks to you, now that we are at the point of separation, that I trust it may be my good fortune to return among you, and resume the duties now temporarily suspended, in the great cause of freedom and humanity. But no one knows the casualties of life; and two voyages separate me from you. What may happen in that space and time, no one but a beneficent Providence knows. If it is my lot not to return among you, I trust I shall be remembered as one who accomplished in his own life the laudable ends of an honorable ambition, and died far away from his native land—without an enemy to be recalled and without a regretful remembrance, and with a conviction that he had tried to deserve the good opinion which his friends entertained of him. Fellow citizens, friends, I am entirely taken by surprise by these manifestations of your good will and attention. I have not taxed myself to consider whether there can be anything in what I have done to deserve it. I had hoped, as I had

thought, that I could pass out of the country in silence, to seek strength, health, vigor and knowledge in foreign lands, unattended, unnoticed, if not unknown. I need not say it is a pleasant surprise. But as we near the place where we must part, sad thoughts, rather than exciting ones, enter into my mind. You will excuse me, therefore, if I turn aside altogether from political questions and considerations, which it is my duty to forego, and follow the scenes which it is my object to study and contemplate. I do so the more readily, because I know that at last the great questions of justice and humanity before the American people are destined to be decided, and that they may be safely left to your hands, even if the instructor never returns. If Providence restores me with health and vigor, it shall be devoted to the establishment and supremacy of the same principles. But we do not know the casualties which await us. We do know only that our welfare is the object of the care of a beneficent Providence. And we do know, too, that a life which has been devoted to humanity, and has endeavored to avoid doing injustice to mankind, is a life which can leave no other than a harmless, if not a satisfactory reputation. Such, if I know my own heart, I hope will be the reputation which I shall leave And now, kindest of friends, whose liberality, courtesy, and attention have attended my passage from my country to the very gates of the ocean, farewell. God be with you."

The closing sentences were uttered with much emotion.

Mr. Seward remained abroad about eight months. During this time he traversed no small portions of Europe, Africa and Asia, visiting Egypt and the Holy Land. Probably no other American was ever received, wherever he went, so cordially and with such distinguished respect. The monarchs and ruling classes of Europe spontaneously offered him all the opportunities he could desire for improving the great object of his journey, and such as are only extended to recognized statesmen of the world. He enjoyed, no less, the company and respect of Kossuth, Lamartine, Mrs. Martineau, Mackay, and other friends of liberty in England and on the continent.

Mr. Seward's return to his native land, on the 29th of December, 1859, was signalized by public demonstrations and rejoicing. At New York, the common council tendered him the civilities of the city, and made arrangements for his public reception. On his arrival in the city, the mayor waited upon him and accompanied him to the City Hall, where a dense crowd of people were waiting to receive him. In response to Mayor Tiemann's address, Mr. Seward spoke as follows:

"Mr. Mayor, Gentlemen of the Common Council, and Fellow Citizens: I do not mean to yield to the impulses of feeling on this occasion, although I can scarcely conceive what would be more flattering to me than this reception in the

metropolis of my native country, and under the auspices of the municipal authorities of this flourishing city. Nevertheless, I answer that my seeming indifference to the cordial welcome would argue me guilty, not merely of caprice in regard to my fellow citizens, but of ingratitude to the Divine Being whose goodness has permitted me again to enter the circle of true patriots and of endeared and life-tried friends.

"In the eastern regions, from which we have derived the revelations of divine truth, a paralysis rests upon society, which leaves little else to be noted than those monuments of Christian faith which none can study without grateful emotions. I have been able on many occasions to compare the existing condition of society in Europe with what existed there twenty-five years ago, when I had the fortune to visit the eastern continent.

"I think that I can safely say that society—all the nations—on that continent are more prosperous now than they have ever been before, and are making decided progress in all substantial improvements. But it is manifest that the institutions of government existing there are either too ancient, or were founded on ancient principles, and are not adapted to the exigencies of the present day.

"Therefore it is that every country in Europe is balancing between the desire for beneficial changes and the fear of innovation. Our own system, constructed later and under better and happier auspices, alone seems to afford its citizens freedom from such difficulties and such apprehensions.

"It must always be difficult to determine how far we can lend encouragement to those who seek to reform the institutions of their own country, even when there is hope of benefit to them as a people. But this we can always do: we can conduct our internal affairs and our foreign relations with truth, candor, justice and moderation, and thus commend our better system to other nations. This republic may prove to them that its system of government is founded upon public virtue, that as a people we are at unity among ourselves, and that we are seeking only by lawful means to promote the welfare of mankind."

Addressing the committees and the citizens generally, in reply to an address by Judge Peabody on their behalf, he said:

"My memory gives back the recollections of May last, when you accompanied me to the steamer on the occasion of my departure abroad. I know not how much I am indebted to that manifestation of cordiality for the friendly reception which met me in all the countries which I visited, which was so grateful to my feelings. But no day was so pleasant to me as the one which brought me to my native country

"In the Old World I saw much to admire, much to appreciate; but not so much as there is to admire in the prosperity of my native land. I had visited England a quarter of a century ago. I was asked on this visit whether I had seen signs of change and improvement. To this I replied that I had; and was asked whether there had not been changes and improvements in my own country. I replied, with pride, 'Yes.' Twenty-six years ago, I left London built of stone, and New York was built of brick. Now, London and Paris are indeed both of stone—New York of marble."

His route home was a triumphal procession. At every place on the way, from New York to Auburn, bonfires, cannon, and speeches awaited his arrival. His reception in Auburn was such as could have been prepared and given only by sincere and devoted friends to a loved fellow citizen and cherished benefactor. The railroad depot and the streets of the city through which he passed, were thronged with people. The military, the city officials, and the children of the public schools, bearing banners—"Welcome to Senator Seward"—accompanied him to his house.

At the gates of his residence, he met the clergymen of every denomination in the town, waiting to take him by the hand and welcome him home. Mr. Seward, it was observed, was more deeply affected by this scene than any through which he had passed. He was able to return their hearty greeting only in silence, as he passed through the line they had formed, into his house.

His reply to an address made to him by Michael S. Myers, Esq., on behalf of the people, at the railroad depot, was a spontaneous and familiar talk with his friends.

"It is true," he said, "as you have reminded me, that I have reached another stage in a journey that has occupied eight months of time and covered ten thousand miles of space—the last stage—a stage beyond which I can go no further. Although in this journey I have traversed no small portions of four continents—Europe, Africa, Asia and America—it is not until now, that I have found the place which, above all others, I admire the most and love the best. This place, this very spot on which you stand, and I stand among you, is indeed the one point on the globe, which, wherever else I may be, draws me back by an irresistible spell; the place where, when I rest, I must dwell—the only place where I can be content to live, and content, when life's fitful fever shall be over, to die.

"It is the spot cherished in my affections above and beyond all others—above and beyond the spot where I was born—above and beyond the scenes in which I was educated—adorned and marked as those localities of my early life are, by mountain and river, by blue skies and genial climes—it is a spot cherished by me above and beyond the scenes of any severe labor—of any arduous achievement—and if I may use the expression without offense, of any personal successes. I love it more than the capital of my native state, although in that capital I have borne the baton of civil authority, confided to me by three millions of a free, brave and enlightened people. I love it more than even the senate chamber of the great confederate Republic of which we are all citizens—although in that senate chamber I am authorized with one other representative to pronounce the will of the leading member of that confederacy. I should not despair of vindicating this preference by comparing the natural advantages, and the social development of

the valley of the Owasco, with those of any other place you or I have ever known. Lakes, meadows, waterfalls, fields, forests are here, which are nowhere surpassed; and comfort, ease, intelligence, enterprise and morals, that may justly challenge comparison in any part of the globe.

"But I will be candid, and confess that my partiality stands upon a simpler and more natural logic. I prefer this place because it is my place. You may as well be candid, also, and confess that you like it best, because it is your place. It is true, my excellent friends, that persons abroad who do not know this attractive spot so familiarly as we do, criticise it sometimes with severity. They point to those dark, massive prison walls, which are just before me, and tell us that they mar the beauty and detract from the graces of our city. But you and I never see those walls, or, if we do, they appear to us only as the boundaries of a field of active labor, productive industry, and benevolent instruction. So, sometimes these distant critics are pleased to say that they think that I, who now stand before you, am not an object worthy of any such consideration as you are now bestowing on me, and you, I am sorry to say, do not seem to be much affected by that objection.

"I prefer this place, because it is the only one where I am left free to act in an individual and not in a representative and public character. Whatever I may be elsewhere, *here* I am never either a magistrate or a legislator, but simply a citizen —a man—your equal and your like—nothing more, nor less, nor different."

During Mr. Seward's absence (on the 16th of October, 1859), Captain John Brown with twenty-one men, armed with muskets and pikes, invaded the state of Virginia and took possession of the town of Harper's Ferry. Their avowed object was to liberate the slaves of Virginia. After getting control of the railroad passing through the town, and of the United States armory established there, Brown was compelled to surrender to a detachment of United States marines, with a loss of thirteen of his men. He and six others were captured, severely wounded and forthwith tried and executed for murder and treason.

This strange event caused a deep excitement throughout the country. The enemies of Mr. Seward and of the republican party endeavored to make him and the party responsible for the acts of Captain Brown. But the attempt most signally failed.

Immediately, on the assembling of Congress, Mr. Mason, of Virginia, in the senate, moved for a committee, with almost unlimited authority and power, to investigate the whole transaction. After a protracted examination of numerous witnesses, the committee, consisting of Senators Mason, Fitch, Jefferson Davis, Doolittle and Collamer, made a report absolving all persons, except Brown and

his men, from any connection with the invasion. The following is an extract from the majority report, signed by Messrs. Mason, Fitch and Davis:

"On the whole testimony, there can be no doubt that Brown's plan was to commence a servile war on the borders of Virginia, which he expected to extend, and which he believed his means and resources were sufficient to extend through that state and the entire south. It does not seem that he entrusted even his intimate friends with his plans fully, even after they were out for execution."

The elections in all the free states, except California, in the autumn of 1859, resulted favorably to the republicans, notwithstanding the efforts of their opponents to excite odium and prejudice against the party by alleging its complicity with the raid of John Brown. In New York, the republicans succeeded in electing a legislature nearly three to one in their favor, and most of their state ticket by flattering majorities. Pennsylvania also chose an opposition legislature and opposition state officers. Minnesota, for the first time, was republican, securing an additional republican senator in the United States senate. Ohio also reversed the majority in her legislature, which chose Salmon P. Chase, senator, at its ensuing session. In Kansas the people, having rejected the Lecompton constitution, decided by a large majority to call a convention to frame a new state constitution. This convention met at Wyandotte, in July, and adopted a constitution which was submitted to and approved by the people of Kansas in October following. At the state election held under this constitution, in December, Charles Robinson, the republican candidate, was elected governor, with a representative to congress and other officers of the same politics.

The territorial legislature having previously repealed the spurious and offensive laws of the territory, passed an amnesty act for political offenses, and a bill abolishing slavery in Kansas. The last named act was defeated by the failure of Governor Medary to sign it.[1] On the night of the adjournment a bonfire was made of all the odious laws repealed during the session.

In the territory of Nebraska, the republicans elected their candidate for delegate to congress by a majority of the legal votes. The territorial legislature passed an act, in the words of the ordinance of 1787, prohibiting slavery in the territory, forever. This act was

[1] At the next session, in January, 1860, a similar act was passed over the governor's veto.

vetoed by the federal governor. In Oregon the result was so close that the majority was claimed by both parties.

In California, only, were the friends of the administration successful. In that state, the election was contested with unusual bitterness. Senator Broderick addressed the people at various times during the canvass, severely denouncing the policy and conduct of the president and his supporters. Among the latter was Judge Terry, who, on the close of the election, challenged Senator Broderick to fight a duel. A hostile meeting took place on the 13th of September, and on the first fire Mr. Broderick was fatally wounded. His untimely death produced a very deep and wide-spread feeling of sorrow and regret. A large portion of the people believed his dying declaration:

"*They have killed me because I was opposed to the extension of slavery and a corrupt administration.*"

No notice of his death was taken in either house of congress until after Mr. Seward had returned from Europe and resumed his seat in the senate. His brief eulogium on Senator Broderick, pronounced in the senate on the 13th of February, 1860, adds another to his several eloquent memorials of deceased associates in the senate of the United States, that have been previously commented on in these volumes.

The thirty-sixth congress assembled on its usual day in December, 1859. But an organization was not completed until the first week in February, 1860.

On the first ballot for speaker, it was apparent that neither party had then a clear majority of the members. The relative strength, as exhibited on several occasions, was nearly as follows: republicans, one hundred and twelve; democrats, ninety-one; all others, thirty.[1] Soon after the first ballot, Mr. Clark, of Missouri, offered a resolution declaring, as unfit to be speaker of the house, any member who had signed a recommendation of a pamphlet known as "Helper's Compendium of the Impending Crisis." On this a long and excited debate ensued, continuing until the election of a speaker, but without coming to a vote upon the resolution. On the 1st day of Feb-

[1] On the first ballot, Sherman received sixty-six votes, Grow forty-three, Bocock eighty-six and scattering thirty-five. The republicans then united on Mr. Sherman, giving him one hundred and twelve votes. The democrats changed their candidate several times, varying in the number of votes they cast from eighty-six to ninety-one. They repeatedly united with the Americans, carrying their combined vote on the thirty-ninth ballot up to one hundred and twelve.

ruary, and on the forty-fourth ballot, ex-governor William Pennington, of New Jersey, the republican candidate, was chosen speaker, receiving one hundred and seventeen votes to one hundred and sixteen for all others. The republican candidates for clerk, printer, and the minor officers were subsequently elected by small majorities. The committees also, appointed by the speaker, were republican, or opposed to the policy of the administration.

In the senate, no delay occurred. Immediately after its organization, Mr. Mason, as already stated, moved the appointment of a committee to inquire into the facts connected with the late seizure of the United States armory at Harper's Ferry, by John Brown and his confederates. Mr. Trumbull moved to include in the investigation the seizure of the arsenal at Franklin, Missouri, by the invaders of Kansas, in 1855. Mr. Mason's resolution was unanimously adopted, after the rejection of Mr. Trumbull's amendment.

Subsequently, Mr. Douglas, who had been detained from the senate by illness for several weeks, offered a resolution in favor of a law to protect the slave states against invasions and conspiracies. The measure proposed was denounced as a "sedition act," aiming at the liberty of the press and at free speech. It gave rise to a heated discussion, involving the question of slavery in its various relations to the government. The president transmitted his message to the senate on the 27th of December, before the house had organized. He discussed at length the Harper's Ferry affair, the slave trade, the acquisition of Cuba, and recommended an appropriation to pay for the Amistad negroes.

Mr. Seward took his seat in the senate on the 9th of January, 1860. On the 14th of February, the president of the senate presented the constitution of Kansas, framed at Wyandotte. Mr. Seward moved its reference to the committee on territories, and that it be printed. On the 29th, he delivered his great speech in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas into the Union, and on "the state of the country."

"The audience assembled to hear Governor Seward's speech," says a writer who listened to it, "filled every available spot in the senate galleries, and overflowed into all the adjacent lobbies and passages, crowding them with throngs eager to follow the argument of the senator, or even to catch an occasional sentence or word; while, throughout its delivery, a constant stream of life flowed up and down the

gorgeous staircases of the chamber, vainly beating against the compact masses who had been so fortunate as to get early possession of the ground; and, thence recoiling and deflecting, the disappointed current would glide into eddies around the hall, and linger in groups beyond ear-shot of the speaker, unwilling to abandon all hope of ultimately catching a glimpse of the scene transpiring below.

"It was on the floor itself that the most interesting spectacle was presented, every senator seemed to be in his seat. Hunter, Davis, Toombs, Mason, Hammond, Slidell, Clingman, Benjamin and Brown, paid the closest attention to the speaker. Crittenden listened to every word. Douglas affected to be self-possessed; but his nervousness of mien gave token that the truths now uttered awakened unpleasant memories of the Lecompton contest, when he, Seward and Crittenden, the famous triumvirate, led the allies in their attacks upon a corrupt and despotic administration.

"The members of the house streamed over to the north wing of the capitol, almost in a body, leaving Mr. Reagan of Texas, to discourse to empty benches, while Seward held his levee in the senate.

"Many prominent men, from various parts of the Union, occupied the reserved seats in and around the chamber. There was an unusally large attendance of the diplomatic corps. This was due in part, doubtless, to the reputation of the orator as a statesman and a leader of a great party soon to take the control of the Federal Government; but more, perhaps, to the fact that, during his recent foreign tour, Governor Seward was received with marked respect, and seemed sometimes to be confidently consulted by the most eminent crowned heads and the most distinguished statesmen of Europe.

"This attention was due in a large degree to the train of profound reflection, the vein of original thought, the graphic historical sketches, the tasteful rhetorical ornaments, the occasional apt quotations and allusions, in fine, to the mental magnetism which permeated his speech from the beginning to the end. But it was owing more, doubtless, to the intrinsic character of the subject and the man, than to any mere display of the arts of the logician or the rhetorician. It was upon *the* theme of American politics; upon *the* problem awaiting solution by the whole body of our people. It was the utterance of a man whose sharply-defined opinions upon that theme, pronounced twenty years ago, then found feeble echoes, but which have been reiterated until they have become the creed and rallying cry of a party on the eve of assuming the control of the National Government.

"His exposition of the relation of the constitution to slavery contained, in a few lucid sentences, all that is valuable upon that subject in Marshall, Story and Kent. The historic sketch of parties and policies, and the influence of slavery upon both, from the rise of the Missouri compromise onward to its fall, exhibited all of Hallam's fidelity to fact, lighted up with the warm coloring of Bancroft. The episodical outline of the Kansas controversy, and of the doctrinal heresy and dangerous tendency of the Dred Scott pronunciamento, have never been compressed into words so few and weighty. Nothing could be more triumphant than his vindication of the republican party from the charge of sectionalism; nothing more felicitous than his invitation to the south to come to New York and proclaim its doctrines from lake Erie to Sag Harbor, assuring its champions of safe conduct in their raid upon his constituents; while the suggestion, that if the south

would allow republicans the like access to its people, the party would soon cast as many votes below the Potomac as it now does north of that river, was one of those happy retorts, whose visible effect upon senators from the slave states must have been seen to be appreciated and enjoyed. His implied rebuke of the tirade against Helper's book, by quoting Jefferson's commendatory letter to Price, the Helper of his day, and his comparison of the attempt to implicate, by inuendoes, others than Brown and his companions, in their attack upon Harper's Ferry, with like attempts to implicate innocent persons in the Salem witchcraft, the Guy Fawkes plot, and the old colonial negro plot, produced a salutary effect upon an appreciating auditory, though uttered in the calm and measured language so characteristic of the senator. And, finally, this masterly and successful speech was closed by an elaborate and impressive exposition, alike original, sincere and hearty, of the manifold advantages of the Federal Union, the firm hold it has upon the affections of the people, the solid basis upon which its pillars rest, and the certainty that it will survive the rudest shocks of fanaticism and faction."[1]

The spring elections of 1860, throughout the north, were eminently favorable to the republican cause. Nearly every northern city elected republican officers. The state elections in New Hampshire and Connecticut and the city elections in Chicago (the home of Senator Douglas) and in Philadelphia were each hotly contested. The administration made every exertion that pecuniary aid and class terrorism could employ. But the friends of freedom proved true, and were everywhere successful. In Rhode Island a division among the republicans on local issues resulted in the election of the irregular republican ticket, which had been supported by the administration forces who made no peculiar nomination. In the state of New York, the counties of Cayuga and St. Lawrence, (the homes of Senators Seward and Preston King,) elected unanimous republican boards of supervisors, and there were large gains in other counties. It was estimated that prior to the occurrence of most of these elections one million copies of Mr. Seward's last speech had been printed and circulated in the various localities.

Soon after the rash raid at Harper's Ferry, some public meetings had been held in a few cities, under the name of Union meetings, composed mainly of citizens who had not as yet been received fully into either of the two parties of the country. The speeches and resolutions at these meetings denied the necessity of any agitation of the slavery question and deprecated what was called the forcing of an issue upon the people, which they did not wish to discuss.

[1] Correspondence of the New York Tribune.

Although five territories were about to be organized by congressional action; although Kansas was not yet admitted; and notwithstanding many southern congressmen were daily urging a slave code for the territories, or that the slave trade be reöpened, a few presses and many timid citizens seemed contented to ignore the issues of the day and to be satisfied with vague resolutions concerning the integrity of the Union.

The meetings resulted in a gathering of very respectable citizens from many states at Baltimore on the 10th day of May, 1860, who organizing a convention, resolved, in substance, that the constitution of the United States was their only platform of principles; and proceeded to nominate for president of the United States John Bell of Tennessee, and for Vice-President Edward Everett of Massachusetts. The convention assumed the name of the "constitutional union party."

On the 23d day of May, 1860, the delegates to the national democratic convention assembled at Charleston, South Carolina. Caleb Cushing of Massachusetts was made permanent chairman, and for more than a week the most violent debates and ingenious parliamentary tactics were had over the question of resolutions for a platform. The delegates were seemingly divided into three classes; one representing the extreme southern views upon slavery, in regard to slaves being property under the constitution and protected by its terms in territories; another upholding the popular sovereignty doctrines of Mr. Douglas; and a third anxious to promote partizan success by saying as little as possible on the engrossing topic of the day, except in the most ambiguous and obscure manner. A combination of the two latter classes resulted in adopting a platform which reäffirmed that adopted at Cincinnati in 1856, with the addition of a resolution referring the question of slave property under the constitution to the supreme court of the United States; and two other resolutions concerning the acquisition of Cuba and the rights of citizens in foreign countries, which were not remarkable for definite expression. Upon the adoption of this platform, the delegates from seven slave states seceded and organized a separate convention.

The first convention, after four days of unsuccessful balloting, adjourned in considerable disorder to meet again in Baltimore on the 18th of June.

The seceding convention adopted resolutions in its platform affirming the right of property in slaves in the territories, under the constitution of the United States, and the duty of congress to protect such property in the territories and on the high seas. This convention then adjourned to meet in Richmond on the 11th day of June—one week previous to the meeting of the other convention in Baltimore.

During the recess of the two conventions, the senate of the United States adopted a series of resolutions, introduced by Senator Davis, of Mississippi, embodying the principles of the seceders' platform—all the democrats voting aye, excepting Mr. Pugh. Mr. Douglas was absent, on account of illness. The administration, also, was understood to favor the seceders; and the conflict which raged at Charleston soon spread throughout the democratic party. In the meantime, new delegates were chosen to fill the vacancies caused by the secession, which served to increase the feud between the contending factions.

The northern democrats were nearly unanimous in favor of the platform adopted by the majority convention, and of Mr. Douglas as the candidate for president; while the party in the south was almost a unit in favor of the seceders' platform, but divided as to a candidate, although bitterly opposed to Mr. Douglas. In striking contrast with this distracted condition of the democratic party, the republicans were entirely harmonious in sentiment, and with no irreconcilable differences as to their candidate for president.

The two factions of the democratic convention assembled again, pursuant to adjournment—one at Richmond, on the 11th of June, and the other, on the 18th, at Baltimore. The former adjourned from day to day, without transacting any business. In the latter, the old conflict between those who would protect slavery everywhere, and those who would not, was renewed. After a stormy debate, interrupted by personal collisions, those who favored slavery protection again seceded, and organized a separate convention. They were joined by Caleb Cushing, the chairman of the original convention. The remaining members, with a new presiding officer, proceeded to nominate candidates for president and vice-president of the United States.

Stephen A. Douglas was nominated for president on the second ballot, receiving one hundred and eighty-one and a half votes of the one hundred and ninety-four and a half cast. Benjamin Fitzpatrick, of Alabama, was named for vice-president. He, however, declined the nomination, after the convention had adjourned, and Herschel V. Johnson, of Georgia, was substituted by the national democratic committee. The platform, as adopted by this convention at its session in Charleston, reflects the sentiments of Senator Douglas and that portion of the democratic party in the northern states who no longer support all the demands of the slave power.

The seceders, who held their convention at the same time in another part of the city, nominated for president of the United States, John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and for vice-president, Joseph Lane, of Oregon,[1] and adopted as their platform, substantially, the one rejected at Charleston by the original convention. It boldly denies the power of any territorial legislature to exclude slavery from its domain; and maintains that it is the duty of congress to protect slavery, to the fullest extent, on the high seas, in the territories, and wherever its constitutional power extends.

The second national convention of the republican party, met at Chicago on the 16th day of May, 1860—the fifty-ninth birthday of Mr. Seward. The convention was called to order at noon by Governor Morgan, of New York, the chairman of the national committee. David Wilmot, of Pennsylvania, was chosen temporary chairman by a unanimous vote. At a subsequent session a permanent organization was completed by the election of George Ashmun, of Massachusetts, as president, with twenty-seven vice-presidents, and as many secretaries, representing each state and territory in convention.[2]

A platform of principles was adopted by the convention with great enthusiasm and unanimity.[3] It recognizes the great doctrine of the declaration of independence "that all men are created equal,"

1 Mr. Breckinridge received eighty-one votes, and Daniel S. Dickinson twenty-four. Mr. Lane's vote was unanimous, one hundred and five.

2 The following table shows the number of delegates in attendance, entitled to votes, from each state and territory: Maine, 16; New Hampshire, 10; Vermont, 10; Massachusetts, 26; Rhode Island, 8; Connecticut, 12; New York, 70; New Jersey, 14; Pennsylvania, 54; Maryland, 11; Delaware, 6; Virginia, 23; Kentucky, 23; Ohio, 46; Indiana, 26; Missouri, 18; Michigan, 12; Illinois, 22; Wisconsin, 10; Iowa, 8; California, 8; Minnesota, 8; Oregon, 5; Texas, 6; Kansas, 6; Nebraska, 6; District Columbia, 2. Total, 466. Pennsylvania, Iowa and New Jersey sent a larger number of delegates, but were only entitled to vote as stated above.

3 See Appendix.

and declares that the normal condition of all the territories is that of freedom; and denies the authority of congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States.

On the third day of the session the convention proceeded to ballot for candidates for president and vice-president of the United States. On the first ballot for president, the votes were divided as follows:

For	William H. Seward, of New York,	173½
"	Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois,	102
"	Edward Bates, of Missouri,	48
"	Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania,	50½
"	John McLean, of Ohio,	12
"	Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio,	49
"	Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio,	3
"	William L. Dayton, of New Jersey,	14
"	John M. Read, of Pennsylvania,	1
"	Jacob Collamer, of Vermont,	10
"	Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts,	1
"	John C. Fremont, of California,	1

Whole number of votes cast, 465; necessary to a choice, 233.

The following table exhibits the vote of each state on the first ballot:

STATES.	Seward.	Lincoln.	Wade.	Cameron.	Bates.	McLean.	Read.	Chase.	Dayton	Sumner.	Fremont.	Collamer.
Maine,	10	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
New Hampshire,	1	7	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..
Vermont,	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10
Massachusetts,	21	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rhode Island,	..	..	..	..	1	5	1	1	..	..	..	..
Connecticut,	..	2	1	..	7	..	..	2	..	..	..	..
New York,	70	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
New Jersey,	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14	..	..	..
Pennsylvania,	1½	4	..	47½	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Maryland,	3	..	..	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Delaware,	..	..	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Virginia,	8	14	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kentucky,	5	6	2	..	..	1	..	8	..	1	..	..
Ohio,	..	8	..	..	..	4	..	34	..	..	..	..
Indiana,	..	26	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Missouri,	..	..	..	..	18	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Michigan,	12	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Illinois,	..	22	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Texas,	4	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Wisconsin,	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iowa,	2	2	..	1	1	1	..	1	..	..	..	..
California,	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Minnesota,	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Oregon,	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kansas,	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Nebraska,	2	1	..	1	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..
District Columbia,	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

There being no choice a second ballot was taken, Mr. Seward receiving one hundred and eighty-four and one-half votes, and Mr.

Lincoln one hundred and eighty-one; scattering, ninety-nine and one-half. A third ballot resulted in the nomination of Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Seward received on this ballot one hundred and eighty votes; Mr. Lincoln two hundred and thirty-one and one-half; Mr. Bates twenty-two; Mr. Chase twenty-four and one-half; Mr. McLean five; Mr. Dayton one; C. M. Clay one. Before the result of the voting was announced Mr. Lincoln's vote was increased, by changes, to three hundred and sixty four.

The states which cast a majority of their respective votes for Mr. Seward on the last ballot were Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, Texas, Kansas territory and the District of Columbia.

At the close of the third ballot, when the result had been an nounced, Mr. Evarts, chairman of the New York delegation, moved that the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, as the republican candidate for president of the United States, be made unanimous. His motion was seconded by Mr. John A. Andrew, of Massachusetts, Mr. Carl Schurz, of Wisconsin, and Mr. Austin Blair, of Michigan, and adopted by the convention.[1]

Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, was nominated for vice-president. On the first ballot he received one hundred and ninety-four votes; Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, one hundred and one and one-half; John Hickman, of Pennsylvania, fifty-eight; A. H. Reeder, of Pennsylvania, fifty-one; N. P. Banks, of Massachusetts, thirty-eight and one-half; H. Winter Davis, of Maryland, eight; Sam Houston, of Texas, six; W. L. Dayton, of New Jersey, three; John M. Read, of Pennsylvania, one. On the second and last ballot, Mr. Hamlin received three hundred and sixty-seven votes; Mr. Clay eighty-six, Mr. Hickman thirteen. Mr. Hamlin's nomination was then made unanimous.

These nominations, as well as the platform adopted by the convention, received the cordial approval of Mr. Seward. In private and in public he promptly gave them his hearty indorsement. On the day on which the nominations were made he wrote for the Auburn Daily Advertiser, as follows:

1 For the eloquent remarks made by these gentlemen, and others, at the time, see Appendix

"No truer exposition of the republican creed could be given, than the platform adopted by the convention contains. No truer or firmer defenders of the republican faith could have been found in the Union, than the distinguished and esteemed citizens on whom the honors of the nomination have fallen. Their election, we trust, by a decisive majority, will restore the government of the United States to its constitutional and ancient course. Let the watchword of the republican party, then, be Union and Liberty, and onward to victory."

Two days afterwards he addressed the following reply to a letter from the central republican committee of the city of New York:[1]

"AUBURN, May 21, 1860.

"GENTLEMEN: I will not affect to conceal the sensibility with which I have received the letters in which you and so many other respected friends have tendered to me expressions of renewed and enduring confidence. These letters will remain with me as assurances in future years that, although I was not unwilling to await, even for another age, the vindication of my political principles, yet that they did nevertheless receive the generous support of many good, wise and patriotic men of my own time.

"Such assurances, however made, under the circumstances now existing, derive their priceless value largely from the fact that they steal upon me through the channels of private correspondence, and altogether unknown to the world. You will at once perceive that such expressions would become painful to me, and justly offensive to the community, if they should be allowed to take on any public or conventional form of manifestation. For this reason, if it were respectful and consistent with your own public purposes, I would have delayed my reply to you until I could have had an opportunity of making it verbally next week on my way to Washington, after completing the arrangements for the repairs upon my dwelling here, rendered necessary by a recent fire.

The same reason determines me also to decline your kind invitation to attend the meeting in which you propose some demonstrations of respect to myself, while so justly considering the nominations which have been made by the recent national convention at Chicago. At the same time, it is your right to have a frank and candid exposition of my own opinions and sentiments on that important subject.

My friends know very well that, while they have always generously made my promotion to public trusts their own exclusive care, mine has only been to execute them faithfully, so as to be able, at the close of their assigned terms, to resign them into the hands of the people without forfeiture of the public confidence. The presentation of my name to the Chicago convention was thus their act, not mine. The disappointment, therefore, is their disappointment, not mine. It may have found them unprepared. On the other hand, I have no sentiment either of disappointment or discontent; for who, in any possible case, could, without presumption, claim that a great national party ought to choose him for its candidate for the first office in the gift of the American people? I find in the resolu-

1 See Appendix for the committee's letter.

tions of the convention a platform as satisfactory to me as if it had been framed with my own hands, and in the candidates adopted by it, eminent and able republicans, with whom I have cordially co-operated in maintaining the principles embodied in that excellent creed. I cheerfully give them a sincere and earnest support.

I trust, moreover, that those with whom I have labored so long that common service in a noble cause has created between them and myself relations of personal friendship unsurpassed in the experience of political men, will indulge me in a confident belief that no sense of disappointment will be allowed by them to hinder or delay, or in any way embarrass, the progress of that cause to the consummation which is demanded by a patriotic regard to the safety and welfare of the country and the best interests of mankind. I am, sincerely and respectfully, your friend and obedient servant, WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Congress adjourned on the 25th June, 1860, refusing to admit Kansas into the Union, to enact a proper tariff, or to pass a homestead act.[1]

Mr. Seward labored diligently to secure all these great measures. His speech on the admission of Kansas has already been noticed. In a brief speech on the tariff, he especially protested against a postponement of the question, remarking that—

"The proposition to postpone involves the question of the true value of our present time, and also leads us to consider the prospects of a more favorable season at the next session of congress. We are here," he said, "in the middle of the month of June, which is yet one, or two, or even three months earlier than congress has been accustomed to adjourn. Before the adoption of the present salary system, no man would have felt himself bound to put off this question of a tariff, at this season of the year, because of a want of time. It is now of no consequence, as a question of economy, to the public at all whether we sit here till August or adjourn to-day. If we have not time enough to consider this question, somebody is responsible for that lack of time. Who is responsible? We were at liberty to sit here till the month of December next. But ten days ago a majority of the senate—a majority of whom were understood to be opposed to this principle of protection—fixed an arbitrary period, and shortened up the time of congress until Monday next, with the full knowledge that this question was to be acted upon."

But his counsels, joined with those of Mr. Cameron and other republican senators, were unheeded, and the subject was postponed.

The attention of congress was, several times and in various ways, called to the alarming increase of the African slave trade. A pro-

1 A compromise homestead bill passed both houses, but was vetoed by the president. The vote in the senate, by which Kansas was kept out of the Union, stood twenty-seven to thirty-two—Messrs. Bigler and Pugh voting with the republicans. Messrs. Douglas and Crittenden were absent—the former having paired with Mr. Clay, of Alabama. The house voted to admit, by ayes one hundred and thirty-four, nays seventy-three.

position was made in the senate to amend the naval appropriation bill so as to provide three steam vessels for its suppression. Mr. Seward warmly advocated the motion, but it failed, by yeas eighteen, nays twenty-five. He availed himself of the occasion, however, to call the attention of the country to an elaborate bill that he had submitted to the senate, at a previous session, for arresting the slave trade, which he pledged himself to bring to the consideration of the senate at the next meeting of congress.

Congress also neglected to adopt any decisive measures for constructing a railroad to the Pacific ocean, and curtailed the mail facilities already existing between California and the eastern states. A large portion of the time of the senate, as well as that of the house, was occupied in debates on the subject of slavery. The resolutions of Mr. Jefferson Davis, and those of Mr. Douglas, consumed several weeks of the session in the senate, while the delay in electing a speaker, and the discussion of the resolution offered by Mr. Clark, of Missouri, in the house, seemed to leave little opportunity for the consideration and disposal of various important practical measures, awaiting the action of congress.

Avoiding the usual summer resorts, Mr. Seward sought recreation during the month of July (1860), in brief visits to cherished friends in Vermont, Maine, and Massachusetts. He was unable to escape public attentions on the way, but was interrupted at various places with popular demonstrations of respect and affection. At Windsor and Bellows Falls, in Vermont; Keene and Dover, in New Hampshire; Bangor and Portland, in Maine, and many lesser places, large crowds of people assembled to greet him. The public authorities of the states, cities and towns welcomed his appearance among them. Mr. Seward spoke briefly in response to the addresses that were made to him, eliciting hearty applause. After a brief stay with his friend, Israel Washburn, Jr.,[1] Mr. Seward proceeded homeward through the state of Massachusetts. At Boston he was received with distinguished honor. The governor of the state[2] presented him to the people, in a complimentary speech, which was received by them with repeated expressions of cordial sympathy. Brief addresses were also made by Charles Francis Adams and Henry Wilson, who had accompanied Mr. Seward from the depot to the Revere House. A band

[1] Since elected governor of the state of Maine. [2] Nathaniel P. Banks. See Appendix.

of music played several national airs; and, although it was nearly midnight, the crowd listened to Mr. Seward's speech with singular enthusiasm. Mr. Seward spoke as follows:

"CITIZENS OF BOSTON—OF MASSACHUSETTS: I have heard your explanation from my excellent and esteemed friend, the chief magistrate of your state. Something, however, seems to me to be due from myself, to you and to the country, for the unexpected surprise which has overtaken me. It is so contrary to the habit of my whole life to be arrested on a journey which had for its object but the performance of a duty of friendship, and was commenced and prosecuted, and hoped to be ended, in a manner entirely private, that I am sure some explanation will be expected of me. That explanation is a very simple one. I have made a great mistake. I have committed a great blunder. I have been very weak. My first mistake was in supposing that it was safe to trust myself on a railroad through New England and down east, instead of the telegraph. I found out my mistake only when it was too late; for although I succeeded in finding the wide-awakes at Bangor fast asleep in the middle of the day, yet I very quickly discovered that they woke up quite too soon for the convenience of a quiet traveler. I certainly have not besought, and have not desired, any demonstration of consideration at the hands of my fellow citizens. There are many reasons why I prefer to seek the satisfaction of the attempt to perform my duty, in my own conscience and not in the acclamations of my fellow men; but it is God's will that we must be overruled and disappointed, and I have submitted with such graciousness as I can.

"Fellow citizens, I have endeavored, all along the road—for this, I think, is the seventh or eighth time that I have been called out to meet a kind and cordial welcome on this day only—I have endeavored to accommodate myself to this form of reception by treating it as a light and trivial affair, trusting that those who have been so exceedingly kind to me would believe, after all, that there was gratitude, unexpressed and strong, concealed under the face of a simple, honest good nature. But, fellow citizens, the case is altered when I come upon the soil of Massachusetts. I cannot say that I have a veneration, though I have a profound affection, for Vermont. Her statesmen are not my teachers—her people are but my equals. Although I honor them and respect and love them for their fidelity to the interests of their country and to the cause of justice and humanity, they are still but my fellow laborers in the vineyard. I can say the same of New Hampshire, that I know none of her statesmen or her sons who were earlier in the field than the statesmen and sons of New York. I can say the same of the state of Maine, which I have visited—great and honorable as the works are which have been done in those states by the champions of human rights. I am their equal; I have received their cordial welcome as an expression of esteem and kindness. But it is altogether different in the state of Massachusetts. Here I can play no part; I can affect no disguise; because, although not a son of Massachusetts, nor even of New England born, I feel and know it my duty to confess that if I have ever studied the interests of my country, and of humanity, I have studied in the school of Massachusetts. If I have ever conceived a resolution to maintain the rights and interests of these free states in the union of the confederacy, I learned it from Massachusetts.

"It was twenty-two years ago, not far from this season, when a distinguished and venerable statesman of Massachusetts had retired to his home, a few miles in the suburbs of your city, under the censure of his fellow citizens, driven home by the peltings of remorseless pro-slavery people, that I, younger then, of course, than I am now, made a pilgrimage, which was not molested on my way, to the Sage of Quincy, there to learn from him what became a citizen of the United States, in view of the deplorable condition of the intelligence and sentiment of the country, demoralized by the power of slavery. Thence I have derived every resolution, every sentiment, that has animated and inspired me in the performance of my duty as a citizen of the United States, all the intervening time. I know, indeed, that those sentiments have not always been popular, even in the state of Massachusetts. I know that citizens of Massachusetts, as well as citizens of other states, have attempted to drive the disciples of that illustrious teacher from their policy. But it is to-night that I am free to confess that whenever any man, wherever he might be found, whether he was of northern or southern birth, whether he was of the 'solid men of Boston,' or of the light men of Mississippi, has assailed me for the maintenance of those doctrines, I have sought to commune with his spirit, and to learn from him whether the thing in which I was engaged was worthy to be done. What a commentary upon the wisdom of man is given in this single fact, that fifteen years only after the death of John Quincy Adams the people of the United States, who hurled him from power and from place, are calling to the head of the nation, to the very seat from which he was expelled, Abraham Lincoln, whose claim to that seat is that he confesses the obligation of that higher law which the Sage of Quincy proclaimed, and that he avows himself, for weal or wo, for life or death, a soldier on the side of freedom in the irrepressible conflict between freedom and slavery.

"This, gentlemen, is my simple confession. I desire, now, only to say to you, that you have arrived at the last stage of this conflict before you reach the triumph which is to inaugurate this great policy into the government of the United States. You will bear yourselves manfully. It behooves you, solid men of Boston, if such are here—and if the solid men are not here, then the lighter men of Massachusetts—to bear onward and forward, first in the ranks, the flag of freedom.

"But let not your thoughts or expectations be confined to the present hour. I tell you, fellow citizens, that with this victory comes the end of the power of slavery in the United States. I think I may assume that a democrat is a man who maintains the creed of one or the other branch of the democratic party, as it is confessed at the present day. Assuming this to be correct, I tell you, in all sincerity, that the last democrat in the United States has been already born.

"Gentlemen, it remains only to thank you for this kind reception, and to express my best wishes for your individual health and happiness, and for the prosperity and greatness of your noble city and most ancient and honored state."

Mr. Seward passed a day at Quincy with Charles Francis Adams, visiting the old homestead and the tombs of John Quincy Adams and John Adams. The remainder of his journey homeward was interrupted only by the hearty greetings of the people.

As the presidential canvass advanced, a universal apathy seemed to prevail, and the democratic party began to be sanguine of success. Invitations now pressed upon Mr. Seward, chiefly from his most devoted friends, to enter the campaign. Influenced by these appeals, he left home on the last day of August. At Lockport, at Niagara Falls, and at other places, both in New York and in Canada, on his way to Michigan, he met with a variety of public demonstrations, to which he responded in brief acknowledgments. At Detroit, where he arrived on the evening of the 3d of September, great preparations had been made for his reception. He was escorted from the boat to his lodgings by a grand torchlight procession. The display was brilliant and imposing, and the entire population of the city seemed to be in the streets. On reaching the house of Senator Chandler, Mr. Seward was introduced to the people, who had gathered there, by his associate, in a few appropriate remarks. After some playful talk about the absurdity of his requiring any introduction to the citizens of Detroit, Mr. Seward said:

"It is a surprise, fellow citizens, to be received in this city, which I honor and love so much, with demonstrations of kindness—I had almost said affection—such as could not have been surpassed, I think, in the province through which I have passed to-day, on the visit of its hereditary prince and governor. If I do not say how much I am gratified, how deeply this welcome affects me, please to understand that I can find no words in which to express my acknowledgments; so take what the tongue seems to suppress for what the heart confesses. I have said, in my inmost soul, long ago, that the wishes of the republican people of Michigan should be with me, in all practical points, equivalent to a command. You have called me here, not to speak of yourselves nor of myself, but to discuss the great interests of our country involved in the election of Abraham Lincoln to the office of President of the United States. I have come, cheerfully, gladly, proudly, in obedience to your command. To-morrow I will hear from you what you think of that important question, and then I will, to those who may choose to listen to me, explain my view of the condition and prospects and hopes of the republican party of the country. Until then, fellow citizens, I hope that my respected and esteemed brethren of the wide-awake association[1], who have done me the compliment of electing me a member, will allow me to go to sleep, whatever they may do for the rest of the night; and to-morrow I promise to perform a soldier's duty in their association."

[1] The "Wide-Awakes," of whom mention is frequently made in these pages, were an association peculiar to the campaign of 1860, originating early in that year in Hartford, Connecticut. Composed mostly of young men, they organized with uniforms and military discipline, bearing in their evening parades, each man, a torch. Wherever the republican party existed, the wide-awakes were a certain element.

On the following day, Mr. Seward delivered an able and elaborate speech to one of the largest audiences ever assembled in the United States. This speech was published simultaneously the next morning in the newspapers of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, and Detroit, and afterward copied into all the principal republican journals in the Union, and, both in tone and argument, gave to the whole canvass its marked characteristics of dignity and patriotism, unknown in any previous presidential election. It will be found in this volume, under the title of "The National Divergence and Return."

In the evening of the same day, Mr. Seward was honored with another grand procession of wide-awakes gathered from the interior of the state and the shores of lake Erie. Halting in front of his lodgings, they were addressed by him as follows:

"FELLOW CITIZENS: If I appear in obedience to your call to-night, I hope it will only be a new illustration of an old practice of mine, never to give up an honest and virtuous attempt, though I may fail in it the first time. I tried to-day and utterly failed to make the republicans of Michigan hear, and now, in obedience to your call to-night, renew the effort. The end of a great national debate is at hand. It is now upon us, and the simple reason is that the people have become at last attentive, willing to be convinced, and satisfied of the soundness of the republican faith. It has been a task. We had first to reach the young through the prejudices of the old. I have never expected my own age and generation to relinquish the prejudices in which they and I were born. I have expected, as has been the case heretofore in the history of mankind, that the old would remain unconverted, and that the great work of reformation and progress would rest with the young. That has come at last; for though the democratic party have denied the ascendency and obligations of the 'higher law,' still they bear testimony to it in their persons, if not in their conversation. Democrats die in obedience to 'higher law,' and republicans are born, and will be born, and none but republicans will be born in the United States after the year of 1860. The first generation of the young men of the country educated in the republican faith has appeared in your presence, by a strong and bold demonstrative representation to-night. It is the young men who constitute the wide-awake force. Ten years ago, and twenty years ago, the young men were incapable of being organized. Four years ago they were organized for the distraction of the country and the republican cause. To-day the young men of the United States are for the first time on the side of freedom against slavery. Go on, then, and do your work. Put this great cause into the keeping of your great, honest, worthy leader, Abraham Lincoln. Believe me sincere when I say, that if it had devolved upon me to select from all men in the United States a man to whom I should confide the standard of this cause—which is the object for which I have lived and labored and for which I would be willing to die—that man would have been Abraham Lincoln."

From Detroit, Mr. Seward went to Lansing, the capital of the state. At Pontiac, Owosso, and St. Johns, on the route, the people came together in great numbers to greet him. At De Witt he was met by a cavalcade of wide-awakes and citizens, who escorted him into Lansing. As the procession, with music and banners, entered the city, it presented a highly imposing appearance. The citizens had assembled in front of the capitol, awaiting the arrival of their guest. Mr. Seward was there met by the committee of reception, and welcomed to the city. In reply to an eloquent address[1] from J. M. Longyear, the chairman of the committee, Mr. Seward said:

"That his errand at Lansing was not wholly that of a politician—that he had come among them well knowing that the access must be through a new country, and over rough roads, to enjoy in part the pleasure of looking upon a city, now in its beginning, the capital of a flourishing state, which, within the lives of his children, was destined to become a populous and powerful metropolis. He saw around him the elements and assurances of its growth and ultimate greatness, and he felt that his time had not been wasted, nor his labor lost, in making this visit; he hoped the citizens of Lansing, of all parties, for that day might look upon him as a private man, their personal friend, their invited guest—to-morrow would be soon enough for them to regard him as the politician, or for him to employ his time in talking upon political matters.

In reply to the reminiscence of Mr. Longyear, in reference to Gov. Seward's reception of John Quincy Adams under similar circumstances, Mr. Seward said: "I had arisen that morning at five o'clock, and I found Mr. Adams already up and writing. He asked me who was to address him that day. I answered that that duty had been assigned to me. He said that it would be a favor to him if I could show him the address I proposed to make. I repaired to my library, and having hastily written my speech, I returned and gave the manuscript to him. The 'old man eloquent' read it over by himself; then, handing it back to me, he said: 'Ah, Governor Seward, seeing your speech only increases my embarrassment. I cannot answer *that* speech.' You will not hesitate to believe me," said Mr. Seward, "when I confess that now, when you have applied the address to myself, I find it, as my own speech, unanswerable, as John Quincy Adams did when it was submitted to him."[2]

The next day, the population of that new region gathered to welcome him. Mr. Seward addressed them at length, but only a sketch of his speech has been preserved. He said:

"I know errors, but not enemies. I shall, therefore, speak of principles, and not of men. While you think I have come here to instruct you, I have, in fact, come to complete my own education. I wanted to see for myself how an

[1] See Appendix. [2] See Vol. III., p. 236.

American state is planted, organized, perfected—a vigorous American state. I see it all now, and here, before me.

"The founders of Michigan were not all of one state or country, but of many states and countries. They came from Vermont and New York, Virginia and South Carolina, and other American states, as well as from England, Ireland, Holland, Norway, and other European countries. They were of various religious faiths, and of many differing political habits and opinions. The immigrants from Europe were voluntary citizens, not native citizens, like those who came from American states. They, of course, all were free, for only freemen can emigrate. This is just what would have occurred in every state now in this Union, and what must be the case in every state hereafter to come in, if the natural course of events were not, and should not, be overruled by government. But powers foreign from this continent, although ruling in it early, employed themselves in distracting and defeating that natural course of things. Spain, Great Britain and France extended their sway over different parts of the continent, and established aristocracies which were only removed by revolutions. When that political phase had passed away, it left many of the states slave states. Boston and New York continued busily plying the African slave trade. African slavery being thus established and continually enlarged, voluntary white free emigration practically ceased. The states afterwards divided on the two systems of slavery and of freedom. Some have preferred to retain the former. Its consequences are seen in exhausted soils, sickly states, and fretful and discontented peoples. You have chosen the wiser and better system. My policy—that policy which I have maintained so strenuously and, strange to say, through so much opposition—that policy which I have come to commend to your favor—is your own policy of freedom, instead of slavery, as the basis of all future states to be formed on the American continent and admitted into the Union. It is not only most conducive to the general welfare, but is the most conducive to the public safety and virtue. What does a great free state on this continent need a standing army and a navy for? It has no enemies abroad. It can have no enemies within its own borders. Is not our present army (excepting its temporary office of holding the predatory Indian tribes under constraint) chiefly kept up, with our navy, for the protection of the slave states in possible emergencies? Granting its necessity for that purpose, may I not, as a statesman as well as patriot, say I want no increase of army and navy rendered necessary by increasing the area of human bondage?

"How simple, then, and yet how wise and how felicitous, is the policy of the republican party. All it proposes is that all future states shall be just such free, enlightened, contented, and prosperous states, as Michigan is; and, further, that they shall be made so exactly as Michigan was made such a state. That process is to keep slavery out of the territory while it is a territory, and then it must and will be a free state when it comes to be a state. Let everybody go into a new territory who will, be he native or foreign born. Let nobody be carried by force into a new territory, be he white or black, native or imported from Africa or other tropical or oriental climes. If no slaves are ever carried there, no slaves can ever be born there. To say nothing of the condition of the slaves, are the white men politically equal in a slaveholding state? What is the condition of the non-slaveholding white man in a slave state, contrasted with the slaveholder? Let the codes and politics of the slave states show. Let the great emigration of the non-

slaveholding white men to newer regions, while the slaveholder remains in the native state of both, answer.

"Many of you profess to accept this policy, and yet refuse to join the one party that maintains it. The Breckinridge party stand on a platform directly opposite. You will not, of course, support that. But the Douglas party, you think, will do, because it offers popular sovereignty in the territories, so that the people there are, at least, left free to choose freedom. If, indeed, a fair trial could be guaranteed, it might, perhaps, be well enough. But what the prospects of a fair trial for freedom under the auspices of a democratic administration are, let the history of oppressed, harassed, and still ostracised Kansas, answer. The Douglas popular sovereignty creed, moreover, must be taken together with the Dred Scott decree of the supreme court, which, if it be allowed to have the virtue of a decree, declares that slavery is the constitutional condition of the territories of the United States, unchangeable by any popular sovereignty within them, or even by the national authority without. The Douglas creed assumes that slavery and freedom are equally just and wise, or, at least, that there is no public interest and no moral right involved in the contest between them. Slavery will never be shut out of a territory by those who are indifferent whether it is voted up or voted down. The republican party, on the contrary, entertain a conscientious conviction that slavery is wrong, and, acting on that conviction, they, and they alone, will save the territories from its blight, and so make sure that they become ultimately free states."

The occasion brought out a grand republican display and mass meeting. The people from all the surrounding country came, in unprecedented numbers. In the immense procession, which formed a part of the ceremonies, were the faculty and students of the state agricultural college, with appropriate emblems. They presented to Mr. Seward the following address, which was said to be the expression of the public sentiment of Michigan:

"In common with the young men of Michigan, we take pride in welcoming you to our state. We have learned to admire you for your talents, love you for your devotion to the cause of truth and humanity, and look to you for instruction in the great principles of civil liberty and equal rights.

"We believe in a 'higher law;' we believe that slavery and freedom are incompatible, and that the conflict must be 'irrepressible' so long as they are elements of the same government. We believe that right must finally triumph; that oppression must cease, and we look to the success of republican principles to restore our government to its original purity and foster the true spirit of national prosperity.

"We take pleasure in addressing you from the halls of the first State Agricultural College in our land, and as a champion of human progress you cannot fail to be an earnest and sincere friend to the cause of education. We should have rejoiced to labor to secure your election to the chief magistracy of the nation, but we honor you none the less as the great expounder of the rights of man, and

while, in the past, you have presented so clearly before our minds the truths which are at the foundation of every just and stable government, may you be spared many years to bless our common country with your counsels and efforts for the good of the race. Be assured that you live in the hearts of the freedom-loving young men of America."

In the evening, Mr. Seward was serenaded by a German band, attended by a brilliant parade of wide-awakes.

Mr. Seward's next appointment was at Kalamazoo. Proceeding there by private conveyance, he received at Jackson and other places on the road the hearty salutations of the people. His stay in Kalamazoo was necessarily brief. A meeting had been called, which, notwithstanding a heavy rain, was large and full of enthusiasm. He spoke substantially as follows:

"FELLOW CITIZENS: I am here in obedience to the command of the people of Michigan, and yet I am inclined to think that your commands and my compliance were a great mistake. You summoned me here because you thought that your courage or your patience were flagging in the cause of freedom, and yet at every step of my progress from the time that I landed at Detroit, I have found nothing but enthusiasm unexampled and unanimity unsurpassed. I have not long to speak to you, and I will tell you why I want to go to Kansas. I want to go to Kansas before I die; I want to see the Saratoga in the cause of freedom. I am on my way there now, and unless I leave at half-past two I shall fail of that purpose. Have I your leave to go? [Aye, Aye, go to Kansas.] Thank you friends; I know how to win your consent." After paying a handsome compliment to the wide-awakes, Mr. S. proceeded: "I have been much affected by the kind and cordial greetings of my old democratic friends and neighbors, emigrants from the banks of the Cayuga, the Seneca, and the Genesee. But I am struck with the fact, that while they have lost none of their kindness or respect for me, they yet seem to persevere in a hopeless, desperate, useless, unworthy cause.

"There is indeed no end to their kindness to an old friend when he comes among them. I thank them with all my heart. Nevertheless, I confess that it excites my sorrow and sympathy to see so many, and such good men, wasting themselves in a cause which can neither bring them nor their country safety, honor or renown.

"I meet them on the by-ways and pathways and in an honest, outspoken, hearty manner, they greet me, as they pass, with 'Hurrah for Douglas!' I think that nearly every Douglas man in town has come to tender me his hand, and to express at the same time his determination to vote for Douglas.

"Well, now, fellow citizens, it is honorable to Mr. Douglas that he has such friends, and honorable to them that they persevere in their fidelity to him. Still, it is not wise for mere personal attachments or pride of consistency, to waste our votes, because every vote tells, or ought to tell, on the happiness, the honor and the prosperity of the country for centuries to come.

"Of the four candidates in the field, the only man who, in any possible case, and after every combination, cannot be elected president of the United States, is

my excellent friend Stephen A. Douglas; because every vote given for him in the north is a vote for Breckinridge, and every vote given for him in the south is a vote for Lincoln or for Bell, to be counted in the canvass. If you ask your own heart, or inquire of your neighbor, you will find the reason why you republicans are going to vote for Abraham Lincoln, is simply and exclusively because he is, as you understand it, the representative of human liberty. If you go to the south, the great question is brought by the irrepressible conflict of debate to the issue between freedom and slavery, and every man in the south is going to vote, not for Lincoln and liberty, but for the man who can most effectually protect, defend and extend human slavery! On that great issue the republican party occupies the side of liberty, while the democratic party no side, or, if any, the side of slavery. The democratic party is indeed divided into two, one holding that slavery is right, and the other attempting to compromise, and saying that they are indifferent whether it is voted up or voted down. Indifference to liberty is toleration of slavery. There is no neutrality of this kind practicable now. When this election shall have closed you will find this out, because you will then find that the only other man in the universe who was further from the presidency than Mr. Douglas was the man in the moon."

On leaving Kalamazoo, Mr. Seward learned that the steamboat Lady Elgin, with nearly three hundred passengers on board, had been lost the night before, on lake Michigan, on her way from Chicago to Milwaukee. This sad event cast a deep gloom over those two cities, whose citizens were engaged in inquiries and searches for the dead. Mr. Seward, with his party, passed through Chicago, avoiding all observation, and arrived in Milwaukee on the evening of the eighth. In consequence of the melancholy disaster, he declined to deliver any speech, or to allow any demonstration whatever to be made, or even to receive any public visits, during his stay in the city. He remained quietly, at a private house, until Tuesday morning, when he proceeded to Madison, the capital of Wisconsin.

At Madison, a reception more flattering, if possible, than any he had yet met, awaited him. Without distinction of party the authorities of the state, the authorities of the city, the military, the fire department and the civic societies met him and escorted him from the cars to his lodgings. Governor Randall, on the part of the state, and Chauncey Abbott for the city, in brief but eloquent speeches,[1] welcomed his appearance among them. The following remarks by Mr. Seward, in response, were uttered with deep feeling. The sentiments he then uttered, the essence of his political philosophy, were received with a

1 See Appendix.

hearty enthusiasm, not only by those present but by republicans everywhere when the speech came to be published, although often before expressed.

"YOUR EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, YOUR HONOR THE MAYOR, GENTLEMEN OF THE STATE AUTHORITY, GENTLEMEN OF THE MILITARY, OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT, OF THE WIDE-AWAKES AND FELLOW CITIZENS: As I ascended this beautiful eminence, winding my way up its graceful declivities until I rested under the shadow of the capitol, it seemed to me that I had been carried back three hundred years, and that I was moving upon the soil and within the city of the ancient Aztecs, surrounded by beautiful lakes, and embowered in the richest vegetation. So long as this capital has existed I have heard of its beauty, and I am gratified in being able to bear witness that it fully equals its world-wide reputation. I think that the sun never looked down upon a fairer location for the elegant capital of a free state.

"You shall not, fellow citizens, tempt me into the indulgence of any such extravagant estimation of myself, of my principles, of what little I have done, as to make me feel or believe for a moment that this kind reception is more than you would extend, and might justly extend, to every one of my associates in the public councils of the nation who has been true and faithful to the interests of human liberty, while he has not been unmindful of the duty of developing the resources of the material prosperity of the country.

"It has been by a simple rule of interpretation that I have studied the constitution of my country. That rule has been simply this: That by no word, no act, no combination into which I might enter, should any one human being of the generation to which I belong, much less any class of human beings, of any nation, race or kindred, be repressed and kept down in the least degree in their efforts to rise to a higher state of liberty and happiness. Amid all the glosses of the times, amid all the essays and discussions to which the constitution of the United States has been subjected, this has been the simple, plain, broad light in which I have read every article and every section of that great instrument. Whenever it requires of me that this hand shall keep down the humblest of the human race, then I will lay down power, place, position, fame, everything, rather than adopt such a construction or such a rule. If, therefore, in this land there are any that would rise, I extend to them, in God's name, a good speed. If there are any in foreign lands who would improve their condition by emigration, or if there be any here who would go abroad in the search of happiness, in the improvement of their condition, or in their elevation to a higher state of dignity and happiness, they have always had, and always shall have, a cheering word and such efforts as I can consistently make in their behalf.

"Fellow citizens, words would fail me if I should attempt to express the gratitude I feel for this agreeable surprise. I am here compulsorily, not seeking honor or consideration at your hands. I am here, I regret to confess it, as a partisan. But I acknowledge myself here and elsewhere a partisan only, because the habits and customs of a free state allow no man to be a patriot unless in the ranks of some party in the land. To the extent that the party of freedom to which I belong shall require me to go in its service, never asking me to trample on the rights or to withhold the respect and consideration due to the motives of those who differ

from me, I shall endeavor to-morrow to set forth my views of the national objects and end of the great political discussion in which we are engaged. Until then I beg your indulgence for rest and repose, so necessary after a long journey, hoping that I may greet you with smiling faces and leave you with no less favorable impressions when the time for our separation shall have come."

The next day (September 12) was set apart for a gathering of the people, in Madison, from all the surrounding country. Mr. Seward spoke from the steps of the capitol, on "The duty and responsibility of the northwest." He began his speech with the following impressive words:

"FELLOW CITIZENS: It is a bright September sun that is shining down upon us, such a sun as nature, pleased with the remembrance of her own beneficence, seems to delight in sending forth to grace the close of a season which has been crowned with abundance and luxuriance, unknown even to her own habitual profuseness. It is such a sun as nature, pleased with seeing the growth of a noble capital in a great state, may be supposed to send out to illuminate and to make more effulgent for a special occasion the magnificent beauties of the place in which we are assembled. It is such a September sun as we might almost suppose nature, sympathizing with the efforts of good men, lovers of liberty, anxious to secure their own freedom, to perpetuate that freedom for the enjoyment of their posterity, and to extend its blessings throughout the whole world, and for all generations, may have sent forth in token of sympathy with such a noble race. But, fellow citizens, bright and cheerful as this hour is, my heart is oppressed, and I am unable at once to lift myself above the sadness of recent scenes and painful recollections. I obeyed the command of the republican people of Wisconsin to appear before them on this the 12th day of September; and as I approached their beautiful seaport, if I may so call the city that crowns the shores of lake Michigan, and affords entrance to this magnificent state, I had anticipated, because I had become habituated to, a welcome that should be distinguished by the light of a thousand torches, and by the voices of multitudes, of music and of cannon. But the angel of death passed just before me on the way, and instead of the greeting of thousands of my fellow citizens, I found only a thick darkness, increased in effect as only nature's blackness can be, by the weeping and wailing of mothers for the loss of children, and refusing to be comforted. I have been quite unable to rise from that sudden shock; to forget that instead of the voice of a kind and merry and genial welcome, I heard only mournings and lamentations in the streets.

"To you, perhaps, that sad occurrence seems somewhat foreign, because it occurred in your beautiful seaport, but it was not merely a municipal calamity. It is a calamity and disaster that befalls the state, and strikes home dismay and horror into the bosoms of all its people; for those who perished were citizens of the state, and those who survive are the mourners, the desolate widows and orphans who are bereaved. Let me, before I proceed, take the liberty to bring this subject to the attention of the state authorities of Wisconsin, and to ask and to implore that nothing may be left undone, if there is yet anything that can be done, to res-

cue every sufferer from that dreadful calamity, and to bring to the comforts of social life, and of a sound, good, religious, and public education, the orphans who are left to wander in want on the lake shore."

The whole speech was pervaded by a serious and impressive eloquence. The fixed attention of the audience was broken only by occasional bursts of applause. The day closed with a "wide-awake" display, in the evening, of great magnificence. Mr. Seward, after visiting some of the excellent farms in the neighborhood of Madison, and admiring its beautiful scenery, left the city the next day for the Mississippi river where a steamboat was in waiting to convey him to St. Paul in Minnesota. His progress up the river, from Prairie du Chien to St. Paul, was frequently delayed by the people of the towns and villages, on either shore, who eagerly desired to see and hear him. At La Crosse, extensive preparations were made for his arrival. A large procession met him early in the morning, as the boat approached the landing. He was escorted thence to the gymnasium of the turnvereins, in whose ample grounds a great crowd of people was gathered. Before leaving the boat an address was presented to Mr. Seward to which he replied as follows:

"FELLOW CITIZENS: It has always been my purpose to anticipate the progress of civilization in the west, by visiting the interior portion of the continent before the Indian and his canoe have given place to the white man, the steamer, the railroad, and the telegraph. With that view, I explored, in 1856, the banks of lake Superior, one year only in advance of the establishment of civilization above Sault St. Marie. It has been my misfortune that I have not been able to execute my purpose to visit the upper Mississippi until I find that I can no longer trace on its shores or bluffs, or among the people who gather around me, a single feature of the portraits of Catlin, which first made me acquainted with this wonderful and romantic region. I must take you as I find you. I have come here at last, attended by a few friends from the eastern states—from Ohio, from New York, from Michigan, from Massachusetts[1]—with them to see for ourselves the wonders of this great civilization which are opening here to herald the establishment of political power and empire in the northwest. But our anticipations are surpassed by what we see. None of us could have believed that elegant cities would have so rapidly sprung up on these shores; nor could we have looked for such evidences of improvement and development as would have required a hundred years to execute in the states from which we come. This is gratifying, because it reveals to us how rapidly the American people can improve resources, develop wealth,

[1] Mr. Seward's party included George W. Patterson, of New York; Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts; James W. Nye, of New York; Rufus King, of Wisconsin, and several other distinguished public men, who were everywhere received with great consideration, and who contributed much to the effect of the journey by their frequent and eloquent addresses to the people.

and establish constitutional powers and guaranties for the protection of freedom. If we had found you isolated and separate communities, distinct from ourselves, we should still have been obliged to rejoice in such evidences of prosperity and growing greatness. How much more gratifying it is for us to find, in everything that we see and hear, abundant evidences that we are, after all, not separate and distinct peoples—not distinct peoples of Iowa, Wisconsin, New York and Massachusetts, but that we are one people—from Plymouth rock at least to the banks of the Mississippi and to the foot of the Rocky mountains. It is an assurance that enables us to trample under our feet every menace, every threat of disunion, every alarm and apprehension of the dismemberment of this great empire; for we find in the sentiments which you have expressed to us to-day precisely the sentiments which were kindled two hundred years ago on Plymouth rock, and which are spreading wider and wider, taking deeper and deeper roots in the American soil. They give us the sure and reliable guaranty that, under every possible change of condition and circumstance, the American people will nowhere forget the common interests, the common affections, and the common destiny which make them all one people."

His speech at the turnverein grounds was devoted mainly to the idea of disunion.[1] Recent events have given additional interest to the words he then uttered. At several places, as he proceeded up the river, he addressed the people, briefly, from the deck of the steamer, in response to their hearty salutations.

It was Sunday morning when the boat reached St. Paul. The committee appointed to receive him had met him some distance down the river. With them he proceeded quietly to the hotel, without publicity or ceremony. On Monday he visited fort Snelling, the falls of Minnehaha, Minneapolis, and St. Anthony. At the two last mentioned places, he was received with public demonstrations. To the appropriate addresses made to him at Minneapolis and St. Anthony, he replied in a few brief but happy remarks.

Returning to St. Paul in the evening, Mr. Seward was serenaded by a procession of wide-awakes, who, with thousands of citizens, assembled in front of the hotel at which he stopped. A salute by a detachment of artillery having been fired, Judge Goodrich appeared on the balcony with Mr. Seward, and introduced him to the people in an eloquent speech,[2] which was echoed by the audience in enthusiastic cheers. Mr. Seward responded as follows:

"JUDGE GOODRICH, GENTLEMEN WIDE-AWAKES, FELLOW CITIZENS: Every plant, shrub, or tree, whatever its virtue, or its strength, was created not for itself alone; but it exists for the benefit and to increase the happiness of mankind. Every

[1] See present Volume. [2] See Appendix.

man lives, not for himself, but for his country; for the generation to which he belongs, and for those which shall come after him. Every age brings with it some peculiar duty to be performed. Wo be to him, who fails to see, or to assume that duty. His name shall perish. The zeal, the enthusiasm and the energy which mark your action, in the present national emergency, prove that you have rightly discerned the duty and have resolutely determined to discharge the responsibility devolved upon you.

"This kind and generous welcome is recognized, on my part, as another one of so many acts of hospitality, surpassing claim, or expectation, which have attended every step of my progress, since I first, far down the river, set my foot upon the soil of Minnesota. I cannot undertake to express the sensibility which this kindness has awakened. It is not my habit to attempt to express the gratitude I feel on such occasions, at the time and in the place where they occur. Possibly, at some future times and in some far distant places, when you are least expecting it, some action, or at least some word, that may not then be out of time, or season, may show how deeply my memory ever retains the impressions made by the generosity of the citizens of this now youthful state, soon to become, as I believe, by reason of its central position and the intelligence and enterprise of its people, a dominating power in the American Union.

"For the present, my duty requires me to rise above all considerations of myself and even of yourselves, of this capital and of this state; and to think and to speak only of our country and for mankind. To-morrow, I will try to perform that duty. Until then, I pray you to allow me to rest; bidding you, each and all, kindly and respectfully, a cordial good night. May God bless and reward you all!"

The meeting on the next day (the 18th of September) was numerous beyond precedent. It seemed to be a gathering of the people of the whole state. John W. North, of St. Paul, in a very appropriate speech,[1] introduced Mr. Seward to the masses before him. Standing in the portico of the capitol, inspired by the scenes about him, Mr. Seward spoke with unusual eloquence and fervor,[2] while the men and women who filled the capacious grounds, around, caught the spirit of his words and at brief intervals interrupted him with shouts of enthusiasm.

In the evening Mr. Seward was again serenaded, at his lodgings, by a splendid torchlight procession, consisting, in part, of four hundred and fifty Germans. Early on the next day he left the city of St. Paul, by steamboat, intending to reach Dubuque, in Iowa, in time to address a meeting, called on the twentieth, in anticipation of his presence. Unavoidable delays, however, prevented his arrival in Dubuque until midnight. Nevertheless he was received with a

1 See Appendix. 2 The speech will be found in succeeding pages of this volume.

national salute of artillery; and a procession of wide-awakes escorted him to his hotel, where, having been introduced to the people by William B. Allison,[1] he made the following speech:

"FELLOW CITIZENS: Language would fail me if I should attempt to express the acknowledgments that I owe you for this manifestation of your regard and respect. You will excuse me, I know, for passing by what I treasure up in my heart of hearts, the kind words that have been spoken in my ears concerning myself alone. That is the place where I always store memories of kindness and of affection, and there I prefer to let them rest until the season shall come when they may fructify into some action on my part that shall manifest the gratitude which I seem to suppress.

"Fellow citizens, passing from what was merely personal, I have to say that we are here—some half dozen citizens—political pilgrims who were accustomed to worship at the shrine of freedom in the east, and we have taken our scrip and staff and come to the west. We stopped first, as we passed, on the shores of the Niagara river; then on the shore of Detroit river; then on the coast of lake Michigan; and thence we made our way across to the Mississippi, and ascended that magnificent river to the head of navigation, where we rested for a day or two, enjoying the hospitalities of the newest admitted state—the best and worthiest of the three free states admitted into the Union within the last ten years as a result of the decisive action of the republican people of the northwest, since the compromise of 1850. Thence we set our faces downward and southward, hoping to be here in time to have a full and free conference with you, to give you the results of our examination, into the condition of our great cause in other parts of the Union, and to learn from you what may be anticipated as the action of the people of this yet new but grand western state."

Mr. Seward was persuaded to remain in Dubuque another day. The people, disappointed the previous day, again gathered in the public square, eager to hear him speak on the great subjects agitating the country. He spoke for more than an hour of the West, its destiny and its duty, and of the one idea on which its institutions are founded.

From Dubuque Mr. Seward was obliged to travel rapidly through Illinois and Missouri, in order to meet his appointments in Kansas. His journey through these states was marked by public expressions no less flattering than those he had received in Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan. Wherever the cars stopped, even for a few minutes, spontaneous crowds of people were in waiting to salute him.

At Quincy, Illinois, where he crossed the Mississippi river and entered the state of Missouri, he met with a hearty reception. At

1 For Mr. Allison's speech see Appendix.

Brookfield, in Missouri, a collation was prepared for him. Here he received a telegraphic dispatch from Chillicothe, the next large town on the road, requesting him to address the people at that place while the cars stopped there.[1] At first, Mr. Seward was disposed to decline the invitation, remarking that the people of Missouri could not expect him to speak to them when their laws prevented him from speaking freely what he thought. On his arrival at Chillicothe, however, at the urgent solicitation of the committee and a number of respectable citizens of the state, he consented to make a brief address. The committee frankly stated to him that they, themselves, as well as the audience assembled, were pro-slavery in their principles.

"GENTLEMEN: I have been very kindly invited by some citizens of your place to make you a *speech*. I would be glad to do so, but it is impossible. To make a speech, requires a voice; and I have left mine behind me. But even if my lungs had not failed me, it would be impossible for another reason—want of time. A speech has been well defined to be an extended expression, having a beginning, a middle and an end. I might make a beginning; but before I could get fairly into the middle, the train would be off, and you would never hear the end of it. Politics seems to be the all-absorbing topic with you. As I am supposed to be something of a politician, it is, perhaps, expected that I should allude to that subject. Here too is a difficulty which you have not considered. In regard to the candidates you support here, I feel very much like a man, who, wishing to get married, applied to the father of a number of girls, for one of two young ladies. 'Well,' said the parent, 'which of them do you propose to take?' 'I declare,' said the suitor, 'I have not thought of that, I had as *lief* have one as the other, and on the whole I think a little *liever*.' I feel so in regard to Mr. Bell, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Breckinridge. I have, however, not a word to say against either of them. They are good personal friends of mine—of whom I always speak well; and I hope they always speak well of me. But I cannot make up my choice in favor of either of them. From the variety of banners and mottoes around me, I think you yourselves are in the same quandary. What, then, would you say, if I should propose to you to agree on my candidate, Abraham Lincoln? But I need not ask you; I know you would not take him. I think too, that I know the reason. He is famous for splitting rails. Judging from your wide pastures with osage orange hedges, and the scarceness of timber about me, I think you don't use many rails here. So, we may as well eschew politics altogether. I am glad to be able to say that you are located in a splendid country. Fifteen years ago, I visited St. Louis, and, at that time, observed that Missouri was destined to be great and prosperous. I have now come two hundred miles into the interior, and can say that my former impression of the state has been confirmed. So far as I am able to judge you are in the best part of it. You ought to be gratified that such is the fact. I have noticed on my way that you have a custom here which does not prevail in the east,—*shooting for beeves*. And it does not surprise

[1] The Hannibal and St. Joseph Railroad Company extended, freely, to Mr. Seward the courtesies of their road.

me, for I see that your beeves are worth shooting for. You have also fine horses. But if you could come to an understanding with me,—a black republican,—I think we could improve them. During my recent visit to Syria, I was presented with some fine Arabian horses. They are said to be the finest horses in the world. By uniting them with American horses, I think our stock might be greatly improved. [Here the whistle blew, and Governor Seward was obliged to close.] God bless you all! I thank you most kindly for your attention. Good bye."

"As the train moved off, cheers were given out of courtesy to the speaker; and were followed by cheers for Douglas, Bell and Breckinridge. The remarks of Mr. Seward were made in a familiar, good natured style, and had a very happy effect upon the audience."[1]

At St. Joseph, in Missouri, where he arrived late on Saturday evening, he was surprised by a most enthusiastic reception. He was escorted from the cars to the hotel by a large procession of wide-awakes and citizens, who insisted upon his addressing them that evening, as it was known that he would leave the city early on Monday morning for Kansas. Moved by the cordiality and evident sincerity of their greetings, he appeared on the balcony of the hotel, and having been introduced by Mr. T. J. Boynton, of St. Joseph, spoke as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen and Fellow Citizens: I think that I have, some time before this, said that the most interesting and agreeable surprise that ever human being has had on this earth was that which Columbus felt when—after his long and tedious voyage in search of a continent, the existence of which was unknown to himself, as to all mankind, and the evidence of whose existence was nothing but a suggestion of his own philosophy, surrounded as he was by a mutinous crew, who were determined on the destruction of his own life if he should continue the voyage unsuccessfully another day—he went out at night on the deck of his little vessel, and there rose up before him, in the dark, the shadow of an island, with habitations lighted by human beings like himself. That was the most interesting surprise that ever occurred to any man on earth. And yet I do not think that Columbus was much more surprised than I and those who are with me have been to-night.

"We have been traveling in a land of friends and brethren, through many states from Maine to Missouri!—along the shores of the ocean, along the shores of the great lakes and the banks of great rivers—and I will not deny that our footsteps have been made pleasant by kind and friendly and fraternal greetings. We entered the soil of Missouri this morning, at ten o'clock, feeling that, although we had a right to regard the people of Missouri as our brethren, and although we were their brethren and friends, yet we were to be regarded by its citizens as strangers, if not aliens and enemies; but this welcome which greets us here sur-

1 The above report of Mr. Seward's remarks is taken from the *Free Democrat*, published at St. Joseph, Missouri.

passes anything that we have experienced in our sojournings from Bangor, in the state of Maine, to this place. The discovery that here there is so much of kindness for us, so much of respect and consideration, takes us by surprise. I will confess freely that it affects us with deep sensibility, for we did not propose to visit St. Joseph. There is a land beyond you—a land redeemed and saved for freedom, through trials and sufferings that have commended its young and growing people to the respect of mankind and to our peculiar sympathy.

"We proposed to be quiet travelers through the state of Missouri, hoping and expecting without stopping here, to rest this night on the other side of the Missouri, where we knew we would be welcome. [A voice—'We won't hurt you.'] No, I know you won't hurt me. The man who never wished evil to any human being, who challenges enemies as well as friends to show the wrong with which any being made in his own form can accuse him when he comes before the bar of justice, has no fear of being harmed in the country of his birth and of his affection. But I stated that, not merely for the purpose of showing how agreeable is this fraternal welcome. It is full of promise. I pass over all that has been said to me of consideration for myself. There are subjects on which I take no verdict from my fellow citizens. I choose to take the approbation, if I can get it, of my own conscience, and to wait till a future age for the respect and consideration of mankind. But I will dwell for one moment on this extraordinary scene, full of assurance on many points, and interesting to every one of you as it is to me.

"The most cheering fact, as it is the most striking one in it, is that we who are visitors and pilgrims to Kansas, beyond you, find that we have reached Kansas already on the northern shores of the Missouri river. Now come up here—if there are any such before me—you, who are so accustomed to sound an alarm about the danger of a dissolution of the Union; come up here, and look at the scene of Kansas and Missouri, so lately hostile, brought together on either shore in the bonds of fraternal affection and friendship. That is exactly what will always occur whenever you attempt to divide this people and to set one portion against another. The moment you have brought the people to the point where there is the least degree of danger to the national existence felt, then those whom party malice or party ambition have arrayed against each other as enemies, will embrace each other as friends and brethren.

"Let me tell you this simple truth; that though you live in a land of slavery there is not a man among you who does not love slavery less than he loves the Union. Nor have I ever met the man who loved freedom so much, under any of the aspects involved in the present presidential issues, as he loved the Union, for it is only through the stability and perpetuity of this Union that any blessings whatever may be expected to descend on the American people.

"And now, fellow citizens, there is another lesson which this occasion and this demonstration teach. They teach that there is no difference whatever in the nature, constitution or character of the people of the several states of this Union, or of the several sections of this Union. They are all of one nature, even if they are not all native born, and educated in the same sentiments. Although many of them came from distant lands, still the very effect of their being American citizens is to make them all alike.

"I will tell you why this is so. The reason is simply this: The democratic principle that every man ought to be the owner of the soil that he cultivates, and the owner of the limbs and the head that he applies to that culture, has been adopted in some of the states earlier than in others; and where it was adopted earliest it has worked out the fruits of higher advancement, of greater enterprise, of greater prosperity. Where it has not been adopted, enterprise and industry have languished in proportion. But it is going through; it is bound to go through. [A voice—'It's not going through here.'] Yes, here. As it has already gone through eighteen states of the Union so it is bound to go through all of the other fifteen. It is bound to go through all of the thirty-three states of the Union for the simple reason that it is going through the world."

On Monday (September 24), Mr. Seward reached Kansas. As he passed down the Missouri river, he was recognized at several places on the Missouri and Kansas shores of the river, and saluted with cheers, entering into frank and familiar conversations with the people. His first step on the soil of Kansas, at Leavenworth, was announced by the firing of cannon and the shouts of thousands of people. He was escorted to the hotel by a procession of citizens, including all the mechanics in the city, bearing their various tools and implements. Mr. A. C. Wilder, in introducing Mr. Seward to the people, spoke of him as the representative of Kansas in the senate of the United States.[1] Mr. Seward's remarks in response were, at the time, briefly sketched as follows:

"Mr. Seward began his reply by saying that it was well that he had not the voice to enable him to speak at length, for the emotions which were crowding upon him could not be expressed in words. He would not have them think him wanting in gratitude, if his language failed to express the feelings which oppressed him. Many years ago, when he visited General Lafayette, the brave Frenchman who fought for us, he saw, at the entrance of his residence, two brass cannons, which bore the inscription, 'Presented by the liberty-loving citizens of Paris.' Here, at his entrance into Kansas, he found two symbols of the spirit of her free people. The one was the cannon which was booming on the hill near by. He had heard that it was captured by the free state men during the commotion which existed several years ago, when they were struggling for free institutions. Another evidence of the free impulses by which we were animated was the organization of the wide-awakes whom he saw around him, not in the customary costume of that body, but as an army of free laboring men—carpenters, masons, and mechanics of all kinds—who had come out, in their working clothes, with their tools of all kinds, in a body, to welcome him. Mr. Seward proceeded to pay a handsome compliment to the wide-awake club. He then alluded again to the subject of free labor, and said that it must be respected as being the foundation of

[1] See Appendix.

our strength and prosperity. Whatever of reputation he had acquired was due mainly to the fact that he had endeavored, in his public capacity, to lay the foundation of free states, and especially the free state of Kansas. He then paid a glowing tribute to the people of this territory. He said they had achieved freedom for themselves; and now it was their duty to aid in securing it to the embryo states around them. Kansas stood as a sentinel in the pathway to the large region of country extending from the British possessions on the north to Texas on the south and west beyond the Rocky mountains. It was our duty to give our influence to secure freedom to the states which would spring up in that wide domain. Mr. Seward then apologized for the brevity of his remarks. He could make but one extended speech in this territory, and that would be at Lawrence, on account of its central position. He closed by urging the people to cherish the free institutions for which they had so long contended. Freedom was not only established here, but would eventually prevail in the whole Union, on the whole continent, and through the whole world."

Mr. Seward, desirous of learning the actual condition of Kansas, avoided, as far as possible, any further public notice, and traveled by private conveyance over as large a portion of the territory as his limited time would permit, visiting, especially, Lecompton and Topeka. At the latter place he was, although entirely unexpected, honored with salutes from cannon. He pertinaciously declined to address the people, but received them all, of both sexes, in a free and easy conversational manner, mingling with them in the streets by the light of their bonfires.

It had already been arranged that he should speak at Lawrence on the twenty-sixth. On that day, as he approached the city, he was met by an immense cavalcade of citizens, and conducted to the place appointed for the meeting. Here he was welcomed to the city and territory, in eloquent speeches[1] by Mayor Deitzler and Governor Robinson, and by the enthusiastic and hearty cheers of the people. Mr. Seward's speech, on this occasion, is a condensed but eloquent review of the struggle for freedom in Kansas, containing vivid pictures of its beautiful scenery, with touching allusions to its impending calamity.[2] It will be found in another part of this volume, and should be read in this connection, as a portion of the history of Mr. Seward's visit to Kansas. Its delivery was hailed with the most enthusiastic plaudits of the people, who had come from all parts of the territory, some of them long distances on foot. The day was closed with the festivities of a public dinner and ball.

[1] See Appendix. [2] Kansas, as is well known, was then suffering from a drouth of unparalleled severity, which had prevented the raising of any kind of grain or vegetable food.

On the next morning Mr. Seward left Lawrence, turning his steps, for the first time, eastward and homeward. Hoping to escape any further attention in Leavenworth, he arrived in that city in the evening. But the wide-awakes and the citizens generally had assembled in large numbers, awaiting his appearance. With the usual accompaniments of music and torchlights, he reëntered the city. Unable to resist the demands made upon him, he took the stand which had been erected in front of the hotel for the occasion, and, after the cheering had subsided, spoke briefly, as follows:

"FELLOW CITIZENS: I would talk to you until midnight, pouring forth all my most earnest and hopeful thoughts, if I were sure that the outside world could know, as you do, that I speak on your compulsion, overcoming more determined resolutions of silence than I ever before had formed in similar circumstances.

"I sometimes allow myself to indulge speculations concerning the period when there shall be on this continent no other power than the United States; and a new constitution of human society opens itself before me when I contemplate the influence then to be wrought on Europe and on Asia by the American people, situated midway between the abodes of western and oriental civilization. One great, influential state must then exist here, west of the Mississippi and east of the Rocky mountains. Which would that great and influential state be? It ought to be Missouri. It certainly would have been, if her people had, from the first, been as wise as you are. I do not, indeed, know, nor think it certain, that Missouri will not yet be that great and influential state; for there is hope—there is assurance—that Missouri, taught, though slowly and reluctantly, by the instructions and example of Illinois, Iowa, and especially Kansas, will consent to become a free state. She has, with vast dimensions, a soil as fertile and skies as genial, and a position for commerce as favorable, as those with which God has blessed any part of the earth. She has need, however, to study the moral conditions of national greatness.

"The fundamental moral conditions of a state, or a republic, are simply these, that every man shall enjoy equal and exact justice, and thus have the fullest opportunity for improving his own condition, his intellect, and his heart, and to win the rewards of character and of influence on society and on mankind. In this respect, you, the people of Kansas, have passed Missouri, and are ahead even of Nebraska, Iowa, and every other state in the American Union. All other states have compromised more or less of these conditions. A stern experience of wrong received from slavery has awakened among you a love of freedom, and a discriminating appreciation of its value, that can never admit of demoralization. You alone have escaped demoralization, which all the other states have, at some times and in some degrees, undergone. Freedom, and not slavery, in the territories of the United States, has been, in fact, only an abstract question in other states. But here it has been a vital, an inspiring, a forming principle. Your territory was made the active arena of that 'irrepressible conflict' between free labor and slave labor, where it came to the trial of mind with mind, of voice with voice, of vote with vote, of bullet against bullet, and of cannon against cannon. You have ac-

quired, practically, and through dangers and sufferings, the education and the discipline and the elevation of freedom.

"If there is a people in any part of the world I ought to cherish with enduring respect, with the warmest gratitude and with the deepest interest, assuredly it is the people of Kansas; for, but for the practical trial you have given to the system which I had adopted—but for the vindication, at so much risk and so much cost, of your highest rights under the law, I must have gone to my grave a disappointed man, a false teacher, in the estimation of the American people. Yours is the thirty-first of thirty-four states of the Union which I have visited for the purpose of knowing their soils their skies, and their people. I have visited, in the course of my lifetime, more than three-fourths of the civilized nations of the world; and of all the states and nations which I have seen, that people which I hold to be the wisest, the worthiest, and the best, is the people of this little state. The reason of it is expressed in the old proverb, 'handsome is that handsome does.' If other nations have higher education and greater refinement, and have cultivated the virtues and accomplishments of civilized life more than you have, I have yet to see any other nation or people that has been able, in its infancy, in its very organization, to meet the shocks of the aristocratic system through which other nations have been injured or ruined, to repel all attacks, overcome all hindrances, and to come out before the world in the attitude of a people who will not, under any form of persuasion, seduction or intimidation, consent, any one of them, to be a slave, any one of them to make a slave, any one of them to hold a slave, or consent that any foot of their territory shall be trodden by a slave, or by a man who is not equal to every other man in the view of the constitution and of the laws."

At Atchison city he was again detained by the people, who had prepared for him a most flattering reception. A triumphal arch formed of oak trees bore the inscription, "Welcome to Seward, the defender of Kansas and of Freedom." The houses in the city were covered with festoons made of oak boughs. He was received by the mayor under a banner, bearing the motto "THE SUBDUERS ARE THEMSELVES SUBDUED." Apparently, the whole population of the city and neighborhood had assembled to meet him. After being introduced to the people, in an appropriate speech by the mayor,[1] Mr. Seward addressed them as follows:

"Referring to the apology made by Mr. Martin, for the inadequacy of the reception, he said that they might judge of what he himself thought of it, when he delared to them that his welcome bore all the impress of those that he had seen given in other countries to hereditary princes. Compared with other demonstrations in the territory, this was unsurpassed.[2] He said he had tried to avoid all such demonstrations which only tend to make him misunderstood, for the world

1 The Mayor was a democrat. General Pomeroy, also made a few remarks, followed by General Nye in an eloquent speech.
2 Atchison was one of the "border ruffian" towns on the Missouri river.

might think that in coming to Kansas he came to receive honors, instead of coming to learn what was necessary to enable him to perform his duty to her citizens and their cause, better than he had heretofore been able to do.

"I find," said he, "the territory of Kansas as rich if not richer, in its soil and in its resources of material prosperity, than any state with which I have been acquainted, and I have already visited thirty-one of the thirty-four states of the Union. In climate, I know of none that seems to be so desirable. It is now suffering, in its southern and western counties more especially, the privations of want, falling very heavily on its latest settlers, resulting from the absence of rain for a period of ten or twelve months. I go out of the territory of Kansas with a sadness that hangs over and depresses me, not because I have not found the country far surpassing all my expectations of its improvement and cultivation, not because I have not found here a prosperous and happy people, but because I have found families, some from my own state, some from other states and some from foreign countries, who were induced, and justly and wisely induced, to come to this region within the last year or two, and who, having exhausted all their means and all their resources in establishing homes for themselves, have been disappointed in gaining from their labor, provision for the supply of their wants. And all this the result of a desolating drought which pervades a large portion of the state.

"I hope that the tales which I have heard are exaggerated, and that families are not actually perishing for want in some of the western counties of Kansas. I have faith in the complete success of your system, and in the ultimate prosperity and development of the state of Kansas; I have it for the most obvious reason, that if Kansas is a failure my whole life has been worse than a failure; but if Kansas shall prove a success, as I know it will, then I shall stand redeemed, at least in history, for the interest I have taken in the establishment of civilization on the banks of the Missouri river upon the principles and policy which you have laid down. I pray you, you who are rich, you who are prosperous, to appoint active and careful men to make researches in the territory for those who are suffering by this dreadful visitation of Providence; to take care that the emigrant who came in last winter and last spring be not suffered, through disappointment and want, to return to the state whence he came, carrying back a tale of suffering and privation and distress which might retard for years the development of society here. I hope you will not regard this advice of mine as being without warrant. I give it for your own sake, I give it for the sake of the people of Kansas, as well as because my sympathies have been moved by the distress I have seen around me. If this advice shall be taken in good part, then I am free to tell you, that in my judgment there is not the least necessity for any person leaving this territory, nothwithstanding the greatness of the calamity that has befallen it. I have seen whole districts that have produced neither the winter wheat, nor the spring wheat, nor the rye, nor the buckwheat, nor the potato, nor the root of any kind; yet I have seen on all your prairies, upland and bottom land, cattle and horses in great numbers, and all of them in perfect condition; and I am sure that there is a surplus supply of stock in this territory which, if disposed of, would produce all that is necessary to relieve every one in the territory. What is required, therefore, is simply that you should seek out want where it exists, and apply your own surplus means to relieve it. If this should fail, and if you should feel it necessary to apply to your countrymen in the east for aid, I will second that appeal, I and the

gentlemen who have been visiting the country with me, and it will not be our fault if we do not send back from the east the material comforts that will cheer and reanimate those who are depressed and suffering. This state, larger than any of the old thirteen states, has not one acre that is unsusceptible of cultivation; not one foot that may not be made productive of the supplies of the wants of of human life, comforts and luxuries.

"The question was propounded to me, not of my seeking; it came before me, because I was in a position where I must meet all questions of this kind; it came some six years ago: Do the interests of human society require that this land of Kansas should be possessed by slaveholders and cultivated with slaves, or possessed and cultivated by free men, every one of whom shall own the land which he cultivates and the muscles with which he tills the earth? When I look back at that period, only six or seven years ago, it seems strange to me that any man living on this continent, himself a free man and having children who are free, himself a free laborer and having children who must be free laborers, himself earning his own subsistence and having children who must depend on their own efforts for their support, should be willing to resign a portion of this continent so great, a soil so rich, a climate so genial, to the support of African negroes instead of white men.

"Africa was not crowded so as to need that her children should have Kansas. Africa has never sent to this country one voluntry exile or emigrant, and never will. The sons of Africa have lands which for them are more productive, have habits more congenial and skies better tempered than yours are. I have supposed it far better, therefore, to leave the people of Africa where God planted them, on their native shores. But the case was different with men of my own race, the white men, the blue-eyed men, the yellow-haired men of England, of Ireland, of Scotland, of France, of Germany, of Italy. Ever since this continent was discovered, oppression in every form has been driving them from those lands to seek homes for their subsistence and support on this continent. There is no difference between us all except this: that my father was driven out of Europe by want and privation some hundred years ago, and others some hundred years later, and some have just come, and tens of thousands, aye, millions, have yet to come. We are all exiles directly, or represent those who were exiles; all exiles made by oppression, superstition and tyranny in Europe. We are of one family, race and kindred, all here in the pursuit of happiness, all seeking to improve our condition, all seeking to elevate our character. My sympathies have gone with this class of men. My efforts have been, as they must always be, to lay open before them the vast regions of this continent, to the end that we may establish here a higher, a better, and a happier civilization than that from which ourselves or our ancestors were exiled in foreign lands.

"This land should not only be a land of freedom, a land of knowledge and religion, but it should be, above all, a land, which as yet cannot be said with truth of any part of Europe or any other part of the world, a land of civil liberty; and a land can only be made a land of liberty by adopting the principle which has never yet obtained in Europe, and which is only to be attained by learning it from ourselves, that is, that every human being, being necessarily born the subject of a government, is a member of the state, and has a natural right to be a member of the state, and that, in the language of the Declaration of Independence, all men are born equal and have inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Some of the states were not established on this principle. They were established a long time ago, and under circumstances which prevented the adoption of this principle. For those states, members of our Union, who have been unable or even unwilling to adopt this principle, I have only to say that I leave them free to enjoy whatever of happiness, and to attain whatever of prosperity, they can enjoy and attain with their system. But when I am called upon to establish a government for a new state, then I demand the application of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, that every man ought to be and shall be a free man. Society can have but two forms by which the individual can defend himself from oppression. One is that which puts a musket into his hand and tells him as the last resort to defend himself and his liberty. The other is that which puts into his hand the ballot, and tells him in every exigency to defend his rights with the ballot. I do maintain that in founding a new state we have the perfect liberty as well as the perfect right to establish a government which shall secure every man in his rights; or rather, I do say that you must put into every man's hand, not the hands of one, the ballot; or put into every man's hand, and not into the hands of a few, the bullet, so that every man shall be equal before the law in his power as a citizen. All men shall have the ballot, or none; all men shall have the bullet, or none."

Having engaged to be in Chicago on the second of October, Mr. Seward was now obliged to pursue his journey with as few delays as possible. He left St. Joseph early in the morning of Saturday, the thirtieth of September, and reached St. Louis about midnight. Here, also, he had hoped to escape any public attention. But the telegraph had reported his coming an hour before his arrival, and the usual demonstrations of a procession, music and fireworks had been quickly prepared for his reception. Notwithstanding the unseasonable hour and the fatigue of a long day's travel, Mr. Seward could not resist the earnest appeals of the multitude to address them. It was one o'clock in the morning when he began to speak. The people were, nevertheless, enthusiastic, and attentive in their listening.

"Mr. Seward said that he had come across the Mississippi, not to see St. Louis or the people of Missouri, but to see Kansas, which was entitled to his gratitude and respect. Missouri could take care of herself: she did not care for republican principles, but warred with them altogether. If, forty years ago, Missouri had chosen to be a free state, she would now have four millions of people, instead of one million. He was a plain-spoken man, and was here talking treason in the streets of St. Louis. He could not talk anything else, if he talked as an honest man; but he found himself out of place here. Here, said he, are the people of Missouri, who ask me to make a speech, and, at the same time, have laws regulating what I shall say. The first duty that you owe to your city and to yourselves is to repeal and abrogate every law on your statute book that prohibits a man from saying what his honest judgment and sentiment and heart tell him is the truth.

Though I have said these hard things about the state of Missouri, I have no hard sentiments about it or St. Louis, for I have great faith and hope—nay, absolute trust—in Providence and the American people. What Missouri wants is courage, resolution, spirit, manhood—not consenting to take only that privilege of speech that slaveholders allow, but insisting on complete freedom of speech.

"But I have full trust that it will all come right in the end; that, in ten years, you will double your population, and that, in fifteen or twenty years, you will have four millions of people. To secure that, you have but to let every man who comes here, from whatever state or nation, speak out what he believes will promote the interests and welfare of mankind. What surprised me in Kansas was to see the vast improvements made there within six years, with so little wealth or strength among the people; and what surprises me most in Missouri is, that, with such a vast territory and with such great resources, there is, after so long a settlement, so little of population, improvement and strength to be found. I ought not, perhaps, to talk these things to you. I should have begun at the other end of the story. But how could I? It is true, a citizen of any other state has as much liberty here as the citizens of Missouri; but he has less liberty than I like. I want more than you have. I want to speak what I think, instead of what a Missourian thinks. I certainly want to speak for myself, or else not to speak at all. Is not that fair? I think you are in a fair way of shaming your government into an enlightened position on this subject of slavery. You are in the way of being Germanized into it. I would much rather you had got into it by being Americanized instead of Germanized; but it is better to come to it through that way than not to come to it at all.

"It was through the Germans Germanizing Great Britain that Magna Charta was obtained, and that that great charter of English liberty came to be the charter of the liberties of the sons of England throughout the whole world. Whatever lies in my power to do to bring into successful and practical operation the great principle that this government is a government for free men and not for slaves or slaveholders, and that this country is to be the home of the exile from every land, I shall do. This, however, can only be done by the exercise of free speech. You can do little yourselves in the same direction until you have secured free debate. Therefore, I finish, as I began, by exhorting you to secure freedom of speech. That once gained, all other freedoms shall be added thereto." [1]

Mr. Seward resumed his journey early on Monday morning. At Springfield, Illinois, the home of Abraham Lincoln, the train stopped for twenty minutes. Mr. Seward was cordially greeted here by a great crowd of the citizens, among whom were Mr. Lincoln and Senator Trumbull. Mr. Seward, in response to the general desire, made a few remarks to the people assembled. Standing on the platform of the car, in company with his distinguished friends, after the cheers of the multitude and the firing of cannon had ceased, he said:

[1] Mr. Seward's remarks were loudly cheered. It was replied that the laws against free speech were a dead letter, and that St. Louis was already a free city—"as free as Boston."

"I am happy to express, on behalf of the party with whom I am traveling, our gratitude and acknowledgments for this kind and generous reception at the home of your distinguished fellow citizen, our excellent and honored candidate for the chief magistracy of the United States. If there is in any part of the country a deeper interest felt in his election than there is in any other part, it must of course be here, where he has lived a life of usefulness; where he is surrounded by the companions of his labors and of his public services. We are happy to report to you, although we have traveled over a large part of the country, we have found no doubtful states.

"You would naturally expect that I should say something about the temper and disposition of the state of New York. The state of New York will give a generous and cheerful and effective support to your neighbor Abraham Lincoln. I have heard about combinations and coalitions there, and I have been urged from the beginning to abandon this journey and turn back on my footsteps. Whenever I shall find any reason to suspect that the majority which the state of New York will give for the republican candidate will be less than sixty thousand votes, I may do so. The state of New York never fails—never flinches. She has been committed from the beginning, as she will be to the end, under all circumstances, to the great principles of the republican party.

"She voted to establish this a land of freedom for you in 1787. She sustained the ordinance of '87 till you were able to take care of yourselves. Among the first acts of her government, she abolished slavery for herself. She has known nothing of compromises, nothing of condition or qualification in this great principle, and she never will. She will sustain your distinguished neighbor because she knows he is true to this great principle, and when she has helped to elect him, by giving as large a majority as can be given by any half dozen other states, then you will find that she will ask less, exact less, from him, and support him more faithfully than any other state can do. That is the way she did with John Quincy Adams, that is the way she sustained General Taylor, and that is the way she will sustain Abraham Lincoln."

Mr. Seward reached Chicago about seven o'clock in the evening. The depot, and the streets around, were crowded with people. An imposing escort accompanied him to the hotel. The streets through which the procession passed were thronged with enthusiastic multitudes. Fireworks were displayed from many of the public and private buildings, and the whole scene was a grand ovation. At the hotel, Mr. Seward, alighting from the carriage, reached the house only by the efficient intervention of the police, returning the salutations of the people as he passed. He soon appeared on the balcony in company with John Wentworth, the mayor of Chicago. After an introductory speech[1] from the mayor, Mr. Seward addressed the large assemblage as follows:

[1] See Appendix.

"MR. MAYOR AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The exaggerated terms in which you have spoken of such public services, recent or long past, as I have rendered will not mislead me. I have a stern conscience, the approval of which I must seek, and which must be the guide for my public conduct. But I should be ungracious to you, and ungrateful to my fellow citizens, who have honored me with this magnificent manifestation of their respect and esteem, if I did not freely and openly confess my entire satisfaction with its sincerity and my appreciation of the affection and respect which it testifies. How deeply, how sincerely that respect and affection touch me, there is nobody but myself can know, and I, unfortunately, can never tell. [A voice, Louder!'] I beg pardon, my dear friend, I can speak no louder; I have been speaking for a month. You must take me as I am. If I had possessed the power I should have done more than I have already, elsewhere. Besides I have some duty to perform to-morrow.

MR. MAYOR AND CITIZENS OF CHICAGO: I may say in almost one sentence all that I can claim for myself. From my earliest experience as a citizen of this country, I was not ignorant of the advance of empire across the Alleghany mountains and into the valley of the Mississippi. The number of states, which since my manhood, have been added to the Federal Union, and their location in the west are hardly more certain in my knowledge now than they were in my conjectured anticipation at that early period.

"And I knew another truth, which has been a guide to me throughout my experience as a representative man; I knew that, whereas in other countries commerce and those engaged in it had been the controlling element and the controlling power of modern civilization; yet that in this country and under the circumstances surrounding us, commerce was not to be the controlling power, but that I have never been ignorant—never for a moment been unconscious—that the political power which directs the destinies of this nation, is exercised by those of our countrymen who cultivate the soil, not those who sell its products in the market.

"Even the wayfaring man, though a fool, might know where the mass of those people who should till the soil would be found. They could be found nowhere else but westward from the Alleghany mountains, and eastward from the Pacific ocean, somewhere between British America on the one side and the gulf of Mexico on the other. This being so, it has seemed to me the simplest duty of policy to take care that those people who were to till the soil—this American soil—and in the act of cultivating it become the rulers of the destinies of this mighty nation, should, in the first place, be located, as far as circumstances would allow, not upon slave soil, but upon free soil—that they should not be owned by masters or owners, but that they should own themselves. And if my public life, my present system—that which I commend to the acceptance of my countrymen with such ability as I may have—need any exposition whatever, this is the simple truth and the whole of it.

"Neither you nor I have any power to disturb those of our fellow citizens in the southern states who maintain a different system; and having no power there we have no responsibility. We need not fear that right, and justice, and humanity, will not prevail in this world, even though we are not in all the fields where battles are to be fought, or instructions are to be given to secure their triumph. There have been already six of the thirteen original states of this confederacy redeemed by the citizens of those states themselves, without interference or inter-

vention from abroad. All the others that remain may be left under the influence —the increasing influence of Christianity, to say nothing of policy, to deliver themselves from that curse from which we have been saved without any interference of our own.

"Non-intervention in the states by free men is but half, however, of the motto of the republican party—non-intervention by slaveholders in the territories of the United States is the residue.

"And so, having abused your hospitality and kindness by setting forth a creed, which I had better reserved for another occasion, I beg you to accept my apology for failing to deliver you a longer address now, and to accept my best wishes that you may repose in peace and quiet to-night, and to-morrow, although it is said to be a great loan to ask, I will pray you to lend me your ears and I will try to see how many of them I can fill."

The trains and steamboats which arrived during the night and early the following morning brought into Chicago, from all the northern portions of Illinois and vicinity, an unprecedented number of people.[1] At noon, a hundred thousand had filled the city. Mr. Seward spoke, in an open square, to as many as could come within the reach of his voice, while thousands, at the same time, were listening in other places to James W. Nye and Owen Lovejoy. Mr. Seward's speech, which will be found in succeeding pages, is one of the most interesting of the series made by him during the campaign. It touched the hearts of the thousands who heard it, and of the millions who have read it. In the evening Mr. Seward was serenaded by the wide-awakes, in a procession that seemed interminable.

He left Chicago on the following day, arriving in Cleveland on the morning of the fourth. The day was rainy, but a handsome reception was given to him by the citizens of Cleveland and its neighborhood, who, in large numbers, assembled in the city park, where he was to speak. He commenced with an earnest appeal for the starving population of Kansas:

"We have visited Kansas, and I ask your leave to bring the condition of that territory before you, for your careful and kind consideration. The soil and the skies of Kansas are as propitious as any people on earth ever enjoyed—the people as free, as true, and as brave as any in the world. They are suffering severely from a drought so great that I think it was scarcely exaggerated when they told me they had had no rain in a large portion of the territory for a whole year. We found that whole districts had produced less vegetable support for human life than are to be found in many a garden which we have passed in coming through the state of Ohio. Districts in which the winter wheat, sowed last year, was neces-

[1] The number was estimated at over fifty thousand.

sarily plowed up, and sowed in the spring with spring wheat. The spring wheat was plowed up, and the ground planted with corn. The corn proved a failure, and was followed with potatoes. The potatoes were blasted, and followed by buckwheat, which also proved a failure. I think that this is a true description of the condition of tillage in perhaps two-thirds of Kansas. Still, there will be no great famine or distress there.

"The occupants who have been there for two, three, four or five years are comfortable and well-to-do, as appears abundantly from their stock, their fences, their dwelling houses—framed of wood, and very often substantially and well built of brick and stone. Large portions of the state are as populous, and exhibit all the signs of comfort and thrift, equal to what are found even in Ohio. But there are emigrants who have resided there for only a year whose whole means have been expended in procuring farms and shelter, and planting their crops, which have successively failed. Many of these are leaving the territory—some say so many as one hundred a day. They ought to be relieved, and a very little assistance would enable them to remain there and retain their possessions and improvements, and resume the culture of their fields, under more favorable auspices, next spring. With much diffidence, I beg to commend this subject to the citizens of Ohio. Perhaps a larger portion of the republicans of Kansas are emigrants from Ohio than from any other state. Do not forget that Kansas is the most important outpost of the republican army; that it is yet, on paper at least, in a state of siege; though the enemy has been driven out, a treaty of peace and independence has not yet been signed."

At Erie, in Pennsylvania, Mr. Seward made a few remarks to the eager crowd; and at various places on the way he met with a friendly and enthusiastic greeting. At Buffalo, where he remained over night, a brilliant display of wide-awakes and a large gathering of citizens called from him the following brief speech:

"Fellow Citizens: I understand this demonstration. [Here there were complaints of disorder.] It is only kindness that makes it turbulent. But in order that you may hear a voice which has been exercised for five weeks, it will be necessary for you to hold your tongues and open your ears. I am now within a hundred and fifty miles of my home, and I remember so much of the Scriptures as this, namely, that 'a prophet is not without honor save in his own country.' So I am not going to prophesy so near my own place of residence. I thank you sincerely for this welcome of myself and of the party with whom I have been traveling in the far west. I have seen, within a year, all the principal peoples who inhabit the shores of the Mediterranean; and within the last five weeks have journeyed among the population dwelling along the Mediterranean coasts of America. I have seen those decayed and desolate countries—the sites of the greatest nations of antiquity—now covered with ruins, and some in a state almost of semi-barbarism. The chief cause of that decay and desolation I believe to have been the existence in those countries of human bondage. The one great evil which could bring down our country to such a level, would be the introduction

of slavery into the lands surrounding the Mediterranean of America. Therefore it is that I have devoted what little talent I possess to prevent the ban of slavery from falling upon the fertile valleys of the Mississippi and Missouri. Having seen many states, I come back to New York, prouder of her; and prouder that I belong to her, than I was when I left. I estimate her so highly, not alone for what she is or has, *at home*, but also for what she is and has in the great west. While I see around me here, so many generous and noble men endeavoring to maintain her in her proud position, I have also found, all along the shores of the great lakes, along the banks of the great rivers, and even at the foot of the Rocky mountains, children of the state of New York, almost as numerous as at home. Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, and Kansas, are all daughters of New York; so is California; and more states have been formed under her auspices, than there were at the beginning of the Union. Emigrants from Erie county, from Chautauqua, from Cattaraugus, from Oswego, and from all the counties of this great state, people the west. It was a son of New York who first applied steam to locomotion; a citizen of New York, and also its chief magistrate, who began and perfected the Erie canal, and over that canal the stream of emigration has flowed which has founded new states. It has carried, sometimes, in a day, the people of a western town, a county in a few weeks, and a state in two or three years. New York has built the west. But I am, perhaps, speaking in too general terms. Doubtless the spirit which animates you at present, is roused in regard to the coming election. It will gladden you when I say, in relation to the west, that I have had assurances there which leave no doubt that it will give its vote for Lincoln. I have seen him at his own home, and I have now to say, as I said before I went abroad, that he is a man eminently worthy of the support of every honest voter, and well qualified to discharge the duties of the chief magistracy. Above all, he is reliable; and I repeat at the foot of lake Erie what I said at the head of it, that if it had fallen to me to name a man to be elected as next president of the United States, I would have chosen Abraham Lincoln. I have promised out west that the state of New York will give him sixty thousand majority in November.

Now, my friends, I wish to know what you can say for Erie county. What majority will Erie county give? [Twenty-five hundred out of the city of Buffalo.] Aye, you count majorities in the rural districts. That is right and safe too. It is very fortunate that, whatever may be the case with the population on the sidewalks, the rural districts are safe for freedom. Why, gentlemen, you couldn't take any man three months from Main street, out into the free, open country, without converting him from democracy and making him so that he would never think of voting for a democratic candidate, or a two-faced candidate, or a candidate with half-a-dozen principles. Well! we'll see what we can do with the cities this time. When the cities begin to find out that they are not going to rule the country, they will conclude, perhaps, that it is better that they agree with the country. It is very strange that Irishmen and Germans and Swedes, so long as they remain on the sidewalks, should wish to be ruled by men in the interest of the slave power. But you say, it is not so here. I have been west, and have seen foreigners there also who did not wish to be ruled by slaveholders. But I have already talked more than I had intended, and must stop. You wish to hear about Kansas? I will tell you. Whenever the city of Buffalo shall have come to be inhabited by one hundred thousand, or one hundred and nine thousand—which is just the

population of Kansas—as virtuous, as wise, as brave, as fearless as the one hundred and nine thousand of Kansas, there will be an end of the 'irrepressible conflict' here, as there is there."

Mr. Seward reached his home, in Auburn, on Saturday, October 6th, having been absent just five weeks. In a speech to his neighbors and fellow citizens of Auburn, on the 5th of November following, he says:

"I have been a wanderer of late. From our own laughing home here on the banks of the Owasco, to where the Green mountains cast their lengthened shadows over the Connecticut at Windsor. After a stay there too short for rest, but not for happiness, to the springs of the Penobscot. From the Penobscot escaping or breaking through nets set for me by not unfriendly hands, to renew my oath of fealty at the tombs of the elder and the younger Adams, at Quincy. From Massachusetts Bay across green hills and greener valleys, over the Hudson, across the Seneca, up and down the Genesee, and coasting the lakes of Ontario, Erie, Huron and Michigan, down the Illinois to its confluence with the Mississippi, up the shriveled river to where it breaks into rapids; and above them where the fountains which supply equally the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, gush from the earth. Across Minnesota and Iowa, down to Nebraska and Kansas, where American civilization, on its verge, is scaling the Rocky mountains, and bringing forth their precious treasure of silver and gold; and thence back again with an eager returning spirit to the Metropolis where sits the soul that sends forth all the mighty energy of that civilization; and then by a hurried flight back again in the night to find my home leafless under the winds of autumn, but already gathering force to put forth a greener and broader foliage in the coming year.

"These are my travels. You will ask me 'what have you seen; what have you learned?' Rather, my friends, ask me what I have not seen, and what unknown, or but imperfectly understood before, I have not learned now and fully understand. I have seen a great nation, a greater nation than I saw last year, although then I traveled the Old World from the Dead sea to the pillars of Hercules; a greater nation than has existed in ancient or in modern times. I saw not only the country, its forests, its mountains, its rivers, its lakes, and its prairies, but I saw its people, men, women and children, many, many millions of every nation and of every derivation."

As the day of election approached it became evident that the result depended upon the vote of the state of New York. The October elections in Pennsylvania and Indiana indicated a republican triumph in November, unless the electoral vote of New York could be wrested from Lincoln. The whole contest, therefore, at once, centered upon the Empire State. The three branches of the opposition, the supporters of Douglas, Bell and Breckinridge, united upon one electoral ticket. The alarm of disunion was raised. The city

of New York was convulsed with a financial panic; and no efforts were spared to extend the alarm into all parts of the state. It was everywhere proclaimed that only the defeat of Lincoln could save the country from ruin. In this crisis, as heretofore, the people turned to Mr. Seward. He was pressed to speak in almost every county in the state. In one of his letters declining an invitation, he says:

"My friends will ultimately excuse the delinquency I am sure, when they reflect that since the 25th of November, 1858, I have had only eighty-five days, all told, for the occupations and duties of home, while I not only enjoy no exemption, but on the contrary have more than an ordinary burden of domestic cares and responsibilities."

He found time, however, to address immense assemblages at several places within the state. At the earnest request of the republicans of the city of New York, he visited that city a few days before the election, and spoke in Palace Garden, to one of the largest and most enthusiastic audiences ever seen in New York. His reception in the metropolis was flattering, indeed. At Binghamton, Fredonia, Seneca Falls, Lyons, and wherever he appeared, the people gathered to hear him, in unusual numbers.

On the night before the election, as it was his custom, he addressed the people of Auburn. His speech on this occasion, although partaking of the character of a familiar counsel with neighbors and friends, was full of his usual broad and statesmanlike views. It fittingly closed the great debate.[1]

The result of the election is too recent to need remark. Every free state gave its electoral vote for Abraham Lincoln, except New Jersey, which voted four for Lincoln, three for Douglas. The republican majority in the state of New York was over fifty thousand. In Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota, as in the New England states the opposition seemed to have abandoned the field. In Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa the pluralities for Mr. Lincoln were unexpectedly large. Equally unexpected were the favorable results in Oregon and California. In the slave states nearly thirty thousand votes were cast in favor of Lincoln and Hamlin. As the tidings of the result spread over the free states, joyous

1 This speech, with those at New York, Seneca Falls, and other places, will be found in subsequent pages of this volume.

demonstrations, in almost every city and town, burst forth, spontaneously.

At Auburn the republicans celebrated the national triumph in an appropriate manner. The enthusiastic procession which paraded the streets, lighted up with fireworks and illuminations, called upon Mr. Seward. Gathering within his beautiful grounds in front of his house they insisted upon his addressing them. The demonstrations of secession, soon so flagrant, were just then revealing themselves. After a few humorous remarks in allusion to local incidents and the result of the election in their city and county,[1] he spoke as follows:

"FELLOW CITIZENS: You have a right to rejoice. I remember that I thought it an occasion for rejoicing when the good cause we now maintain carried one ward in the city, one or two, or three towns in the county, and the state of Vermont alone in the whole country. Who then will deny our right to rejoice now when it carries all the wards in the city, all the towns in the county, all the counties in the state where its argument is fairly heard, and practically all the states in the Union which allow in law and in fact, free speech, free debates, free mails, and free and universal suffrage. It is the earnest of its universal acceptance.

"But there is still greater reason to rejoice in the manner in which this success has been won. It is the verdict of the people for a principle—the republican principle—the true democratic principle of equal and exact justice to all men. It is a verdict rendered purely on conviction, without passion or interest. Not a republican vote in the United States has been procured through terror, not one by bribery or corruption. Nay, every vote has been given in resistance of intimidation and corruption. I do not charge that the fusion votes or other opposition votes were largely given under such appliances. But the record of the canvass remains, and bears its testimony that the main argument of those parties was their menace of disunion, and the last reliance was money at the polls. Who will now libel the American people? Who will deny their virtue?

"But this demonstration of yours has its meaning—its meaning in various relations. It recalls the past, and tells that the erroneous national policy of forty years has been retraced, reconsidered, reversed, condemned and renounced. Let, then, the passions and the prejudices be buried with the errors of the past. It bears on the future. It assures us that hereafter the policy of the country will be the development of its resources, the increase of its strength and its greatness, by the agencies of freedom and humanity. Dismiss we, then, the future, until some new election call you again to your council chambers, to renew your efforts in obedience to the principle that eternal vigilance is the tax we pay for enduring liberty.

"The immediate question is the bearing of the occasion on the present. What is our present duty? It is simply that of magnanimity. We have learned, heretofore, the practice of patience under political defeat. It now remains to show

1 Cayuga county gave Mr. Lincoln 4,000 majority; and Auburn 450—an increase over any previous election. The gain in the state, from 1856, was nearly one hundred thousand.

the greater virtue of moderation in triumph. That we may do this let us remember that it is only as a figure of speech that the use of martial terms, such as 'defeat' and 'victory,' obtain in our system of elections. The parties engaged in an election are not, never can be, never must be, enemies, or even adversaries. We are all fellow citizens, Americans, brethren. It is a trial of issues by the force only of reason; and the contest is carried to its conclusion, with the use only of suffrage.

"An appeal lies from the people this year to the people themselves next year—to be argued and determined in the same way and so on forever. This is indeed a long way to the attainment of rights and the establishment of interests. It is our way, however, now as it has been heretofore. Let it be our way hereafter. If there be among us or in the country those who think that marshaling armies or pulling down the pillars of the republic is a better, because a shorter way, let us not doubt that if we commend our way by our patience, our gentleness, our affection towards them, they, too, will, before they shall have gone too far, find out that our way, the old way, their old way as well as our old way, is not only the shortest but the best.

"Fellow citizens, I should do injustice to you, and violence to my own feelings, if I did not recognize in this visit a warm and most generous demonstration of your personal kindness to me. You know how deeply I was committed to the triumph of this presidential ticket more than to any other in times that are past, and to its triumph more distinct and emphatic, if possible, here than any where else. How the eyes of patriots in every part of the country were anxiously fixed on this state, on this county, nay, even on this town, to learn whether we were true to this crisis, to our cause, our country, and to ourselves. This lent a new and intense earnestness to your efforts, and our success, therefore, has exceeded all that we dared to promise, though not what we dared to hope. The year 1860, how many acts of home kindness has it brought to me from all my neighbors. My welcome from abroad—sympathy with me in my labors for the country at Washington—the rescue of my dwelling from fire during my absence—co-operation with me, so earnest, so devoted, so effective in securing the ascendancy of the republican cause throughout the Union, these congratulations on its success—I feel them all more deeply, more gratefully, than I dare express. May you all find your rewards in the increasing happiness and growing greatness of our country.

"And now we part again. You to lay aside the emblems of your political association, at least for a time, and to return to your industrial pursuits and social enjoyments. I to return to the theatre of public duty at the national capital. May a kind Providence spare all your lives and continue all the blessings you enjoy, and when we meet again in the coming spring season, when these now naked trees shall have resumed their wonted foliage, may our hearts be renewed in their mutual affections and may all the sullen and angry clouds which seem to be gathering in the political atmosphere have then given place to those serene and auspicious skies, which properly belong to the only pure and complete republican system to be found on the face of the earth."

The triumph in the country of the principles which Mr. Seward, through his whole public life, has so perseveringly sustained, was

not more distinctly announced by the election of Abraham Lincoln than it was significantly confessed in congress by the prompt admission of Kansas into the Union a Free State.

The bill for the admission of Kansas passed the senate on the twenty-first day of January, 1861, and received the signature of President Buchanan on the thirtieth.

Mr. Seward, on moving to take up the bill, and while urging its immediate passage, pertinently remarked that "If any people have the right to self-government, it is the people of Kansas."

The senators who voted for admission, were Messrs. Anthony, Baker, *Bigler*, Bingham, *Bright*, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, *Crittenden*, Dixon, Doolittle, *Douglas*, Durkee, Fessenden, *Fitch*, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, *Johnson* of Tennessee, King, *Latham*, Morrill, *Pugh*, *Rice*, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, *Thompson*, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson and Wilson—36.

Those who voted against it were Messrs. Benjamin, Bragg, Clingman, Green, Hemphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Kennedy, Mason, Nicholson, Polk, Powell, Sebastian, Slidell and Wigfall—16.

As soon as the Electors had formally ratified the choice of the people, the president elect tendered to Mr. Seward the chief place in his cabinet, which, after some deliberation, was accepted, and became known to the public. On the twelfth day of January he expressed his views in the senate "*On the State of the Union.*" He had previously, in New York, at the "New England Dinner," made some unpremeditated remarks on the same subject, and subsequently, in the senate, he delivered a second speech, on the occasion of his presenting a mammoth petition from the merchants of New York. These speeches produced, in congress and throughout the country, a profound sensation.[1] The first speech begins with this declaration:

"I avow my adherence to the Union, in its integrity and with all its parts, with my friends, with my party, with my state, with my country, or without either, as they may determine; in every event, whether of peace or of war, with every consequence of honor or dishonor, of life or death."

It closes in the same spirit and with that consistency which marks all that Mr. Seward says:

"I certainly shall never, directly or indirectly, give my vote to establish or sanction slavery in the common territories of the United States, or anywhere else in the world."

[1] They will be found at the close of this volume.

The scenes attending its delivery in the senate, are thus described by a listener:

"Mr. Seward's speech was the event of the week, and is the topic of discussion in all political circles. The scene before and during the delivery of the speech, was almost unparalleled in the senate. By ten o'clock every seat in the galleries was filled, and by eleven the cloak rooms and all the passages were choked up, and a thousand men and women stood outside of the doors waiting to catch the words of the speaker when he should commence. He did not open his speech til nearly one o'clock. Several hundred gentlemen come on from Baltimore to hear it, and the curiosity among all the southern men here to listen to it was intense. The southern senators and representatives paid the utmost attention, and the galleries were as quiet as their suffocating condition would warrant. It was the fullest house of the session, and by far the most respectful one. During the delivery of portions of the speech, senators were in tears. When the sad picture of the country, divided into two confederacies, was presented, Mr. Crittenden, who sat immediately before the orator, was completely overcome by his emotions, and bowed his white head to weep."

The eminent Quaker poet and philanthropist, John G. Whittier, on reading the speech, addressed the following lines to Mr. Seward:

To William H. Seward.

Statesman, I thank thee!—and, if yet dissent
Mingles, reluctant, with my large content,
I cannot censure what was nobly meant.
But, while constrained to hold even Union less
Than Liberty and Truth and Righteousness,
I thank thee in the sweet and holy name
Of Peace, for wise calm words that put to shame
Passion and party. Courage may be shown
Not in defiance of the wrong alone;
He may be bravest who, unweaponed, bears
The olive branch, and strong in justice, spares
The rash wrong-doer, giving widest scope
To Christian charity and generous hope.
If, without damage to the sacred cause
Of Freedom and the safeguard of its laws—
If, without yielding that for which alone
We prize the Union, thou canst save it now
From a baptism of blood, upon thy brow
A wreath whose flowers no earthly soil has known,
Woven of the beatitudes, shall rest;
And the peacemaker be forever blest!

Washington April 9. 1860.

My dear Sir,

Your friend is quite right. He ought to see London, but he must not fail to see Rome. The first is a great reality the last a great shadow of empire. Let him see London before Parliament rises, and then hasten to the eternal city. Paris can wait for his return from Italy, and is never unreasonable. Truly yours

William H. Seward

George E. Baker Esq.

ORATIONS AND ADDRESSES.

ORATIONS AND ADDRESSES

THE DESTINY OF AMERICA.[1]

THIS scene is new to me, a stranger in Ohio, and it must be in a degree surprising even to yourselves. On these banks of the Scioto, where the elk, the buffalo, and the hissing serpent haunted not long ago, I see now mills worked by mute mechanical laborers, and warehouses rich in the merchandise of many climes. Steeds of vapor on iron roads, and electrical messengers on pathways which divide the air, attest the concentration of many novel forms of industry, while academic groves, spacious courts, and majestic domes, exact the reverence always eminently due to the chosen seats of philosophy, religion, and government.

What a change, moreover, has, within the same short period, come over the whole country that we love so justly and so well. High arcs of latitude and longitude have shrunk into their chords, and American language, laws, religion, and authority, once confined to the Atlantic coast, now prevail from the northern lakes to the southern gulf, and from the stormy eastern sea to the tranquil western ocean.

Nevertheless, it is not in man's nature to be content with present attainment or enjoyment. You say to me, therefore, with excusable impatience, "Tell us, not what our country is, but what she shall be. Shall her greatness increase? Is she immortal?"

I will answer you according to my poor opinion. But I pray you first, most worthy friends, to define the greatness and immortality you so vehemently desire.

[1] Oration at the Dedication of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio, September 14, 1853.

If the Future which you seek consists in this: that these thirty-one states shall continue to exist for a period as long as human foresight is allowed to anticipate after-coming events; that they shall be all the while free; that they shall remain distinct and independent in domestic economy, and nevertheless be only one in commerce and foreign affairs; that there shall arise from among them and within their common domain even more than thirty-one other equal states alike free, independent, and united; that the borders of the federal republic, so peculiarly constituted, shall be extended so that it shall greet the sun when he touches the tropic, and when he sends his glancing rays toward the polar circle, and shall include even distant islands in either ocean; that our population, now counted by tens of millions, shall ultimately be reckoned by hundreds of millions; that our wealth shall increase a thousand fold, and our commercial connections shall be multiplied, and our political influence be enhanced in proportion with this wide development, and that mankind shall come to recognize in us a successor of the few great states which have alternately borne commanding sway in the world—if this, and only this, is desired, then I am free to say that if, as you will readily promise, our public and private virtues shall be preserved, nothing seems to me more certain than the attainment of this future, so surpassingly comprehensive and magnificent.

Indeed, such a future seems to be only a natural consequence of what has already been secured. Why, then, shall it not be attained? Is not the field as free for the expansion indicated as it was for that which has occurred? Are not the national resources immeasurably augmented and continually increasing? With telegraphs and railroads crossing the Detroit, the Niagara, the St. Johns and the St. Lawrence rivers, with steamers on the lakes of Nicaragua, and a railroad across the isthmus of Panama, and with negotiations in progress for passages over Tehuantepec and Darien, with a fleet in Hudson's bay and another at Bhering's straits, and with yet another exploring the La Plata, and with an armada at the gates of Japan, with Mexico ready to divide on the question of annexation, and with the Sandwich islands suing to us for our sovereignty, it is quite clear to us that the motives to enlargement are even more active than they ever were heretofore, and that the public energies, instead of being relaxed, are gaining new vigor.

Is the nation to become suddenly weary, and so to waver and fall off from the pursuit of its high purposes? When did any vigorous nation ever become weary even of hazardous and exhausting martial conquests? Our conquests, on the contrary, are chiefly peaceful, and thus far have proved productive of new wealth and strength. Is a paralysis to fall upon the national brain? On the contrary, what political constitution has ever, throughout an equal period, exhibited greater elasticity and capacity for endurance?

Is the union of the states to fail? Does its strength indeed grow less with the multiplication of its bonds? Or does its value diminish with the increase of the social and political interests which it defends and protects? Far otherwise. For all practical purposes bearing on the great question, the steam engine, the iron road, the electric telegraph, all of which are newer than the Union, and the metropolitan press, which is no less wonderful in its working than they, have already obliterated state boundaries and produced a physical and moral centralism more complete and perfect than monarchical ambition ever has forged or can forge. Do you reply, nevertheless, that the Union rests on the will of the several states, and that, no matter what prudence or reason may dictate, popular passion may become excited and rend it asunder? Then I rejoin, When did the American people ever give way to such impulses? They are, practically, impassive. You remind me that faction has existed, and that only recently it was bold and violent. I answer, that it was emboldened by popular timidity, and yet that even then it succumbed. Loyalty to the Union is not, in one or many states only, but in all the states, the strongest of all public passions. It is stronger, I doubt not, than the love of justice or even the love of equality, which have acquired a strength here never known among mankind before. A nation may well despise threats of sedition that has never known but one traitor, and this will be learned fully by those who shall hereafter attempt to arrest any great national movement by invoking from their grave the obsolete terrors of disunion.

But you apprehend foreign resistance. Well, where is our enemy? Whence shall he come? Will he arise on this continent? Canada has great resources, and begins to give signs of a national spirit. But Canada is not yet independent of Great Britain. And she will be quite too weak to be formidable to us when her emancipation shall

have taken place. Moreover, her principles, interests, and sympathies assimilate to our own just in the degree that she verges toward separation from the parent country. Canada, although a province of Great Britain, is already half annexed to the United States. She will ultimately become a member of this confederacy, if we will consent—an ally, if we will not allow her to come nearer. At least, she never can be an adversary. Will Mexico, or Nicaragua, or Guatemala, or Ecuador, or Peru, all at once become magically cured of the diseases inherited from aboriginal and Spanish parentage, and call up armies from under the earth, and navies from the depths of the sea, and thus become the Rome that shall resist and overthrow this overspreading Carthage of ours? Or are we to receive our death-stroke at the hand of Brazil, doubly cursed as she is, above all other American states, by her adoption of the two most absurd institutions remaining among men, European monarchy and American slavery?

Is an enemy to come forth from the islands in adjacent seas? Where, then, shall we look for him? On the Antilles, or on the Bermudas, or on the Bahamas? Which of the conflicting social elements existing together, yet unmixed, there, is ultimately to prevail? Will it be Caucasian or African? Can those races not only combine, but become all at once aggressive and powerful?

Shall we look for an adversary in Europe? Napoleon said at St. Helena, "America is a fortunate country. She grows by the follies of our European nations." Since when have those nations grown wise? If they have at last become wise, how is it that America has nevertheless not ceased to grow? But what European state will oppose us? Will Great Britain? If she fears to grapple with Russia advancing toward Constantinople on the way to India, though not only her prestige but even her empire is threatened, will she be bold enough to come out of her way to seek an encounter with us? Who will feed and pay her artisans while she shall be engaged in destroying her American debtors and the American consumers of her fabrics? Great Britain has enough to do in replacing in Ireland the population that island has yielded to us, in subjecting Africa, in extending her mercantile dominion in Asia, and in perpetually reäd-justing the crazy balance of power in Europe, so essential to her safety. We have fraternal relations with Switzerland, the only republic yet lingering on that continent. Which of the despotic powers

existing there in perpetual terror of the contagion of American principles will assail us, and thus voluntarily hasten on that universal war of opinion which is sure to come at some future time, and which, whenever it shall have come, whether it be sooner or later, can end only in the subversion of monarchy and the establishment of republicanism on its ruins throughout the world?

Certainly no one expects the nations of Asia to be awakened by any other influences than our own from the lethargy into which they sunk nearly three thousand years ago, under the spells of superstition and caste. If they could be roused and invigorated now, would they spare their European oppressors and smite their American benefactors? Nor has the time yet come, if indeed it shall come within many hundred years, when Africa, emerging from her primeval barbarism, shall vindicate the equality of her sable races in the rights of human nature, and visit upon us, the latest, the least guilty and the most repentant of all offenders, the wrongs she has so long suffered at the hands of so many of the Caucasian races.

No! no, we cannot indeed penetrate the Eternal counsels, but, reasoning from what is seen to what is unseen, deducing from the past probable conjectures of the future, we are authorized to conclude that if the national virtue shall prove sufficient the material progress of the United States, which equally excites our own pride and the admiration of mankind, is destined to indefinite continuance.

But is this material progress, even to the point which has been indicated, the whole of the future which we desire? It is seen at once that it includes no high intellectual achievement, and no extraordinary refinement of public virtue, while it leaves entirely out of view the improvement of mankind. Now there certainly is a political philosophy which teaches that nations like individuals are equal, moral, social, responsible persons, existing not for objects of merely selfish advantage and enjoyment, but for the performance of duty, which duty consists in elevating themselves and all mankind as high as possible in knowledge and virtue; that the human race is one in its origin, its rights, its duties, and its destiny, that throughout the rise, progress, and decline of nations, one Divine purpose runs—the increasing felicity and dignity of human nature—and that true greatness or glory, whether of individuals or of nations, is justly measured, not by the territory they compass, or the wealth they

accumulate, or the fear they inspire, but by the degree in which they promote the accomplishment of that great and beneficent design of the Creator of the universe.

"The great end and object of life," said Socrates, "is the perfection of the intellect, the great moral duty of man is knowledge, and the object of all knowledge is one, namely, Truth, the Good, the Beautiful, the Divine Reason."

So also Plato taught that "Man ought to strive after and devote himself to the contemplation of the ONE, the ETERNAL, the INFINITE."

Cicero wrote, "There are those who deny that any bond of law or of association for purposes of common good exists among citizens. This opinion subverts all union in a state. There are those who deny that any such bond exists between themselves and strangers, and this opinion destroys the community of the Human Race."

Bacon declared that there was in man's nature "a secret love of others, which if not contracted, would expand and embrace all men."

These maxims proceed on the principle of the unity of the race and of course of a supreme law regulating the conduct of men and nations upon the basis of absolute justice and equality. Locke adopted them when he inculcated that while there is a "law of popular opinion or reputation," which in society is "the measure of virtue and vice," and while there is a civil law which in the state is "the measure of crime and innocence," there is also a divine law which extends over "all society and all states, and which is the only touchstone of moral rectitude."

Guizot closed his recital of the decline of Roman civilization, with these equally true and momentous reflections: "Had not the Christian church existed at this time the whole world must have fallen a prey to mere brute force. The Christian church alone possessed a moral power. It maintained and promulgated the idea of a precept, of a law superior to all human authority. It proclaimed that great truth, which forms the only foundation of our hope for humanity, that there exists a law above all human laws, which by whatever name it may be called, whether reason, the law of God, or what not, is at all times and in all places the same, under different names."

It ought not to excite any surprise when I aver that this philosophy worked out the American Revolution. "Can anything," said

John Adams, in replying to one who had apologized for the stamp act,—"Can anything not abominable have provoked you to commence, an enemy to human nature?"

Alexander Hamilton, though less necessary to the Revolution than John Adams, was even more necessary to the reconstruction of society. He directed against the same odious stamp act the authority of British law, as he found it written down by Blackstone: "The law of nature being coeval with God himself is of course superior to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all time. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their authority mediately or immediately from this original." Then, as if despising to stand on any mere human authority, however high, the framer of the American constitution proceeded: "The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power."

How justly Knox conceived the true character of the chief personage of the Revolution, even at its very beginning: "The great and good Washington, a name which shall shine with distinguished lustre in the annals of history, a name dear to the friends of the liberties of mankind."

La Fayette closed his review of the Revolution when returning to France with this glowing apostrophe: "May this great temple which we have just erected to liberty always be an instruction to oppressors, an example to the oppressed, a refuge for the rights of the human race, and an object of delight to the names of its founders."

"Happy," said Washington when announcing the treaty of peace to the army, "thrice happy shall they be pronounced hereafter, who shall have contributed anything, who shall have performed even the meanest office in erecting this stupendous fabric of freedom and empire on the broad basis of independency, who shall have assisted in protecting the rights of human nature and establishing an asylum for the poor and oppressed of all nations and religions."

You remember well that the Revolutionary Congress in the Declaration of Independence placed the momentous controversy between the colonies of Great Britain on the absolute and inherent equality

of all men. It is not however so well understood that that body closed its existence, on the adoption of the federal constitution, with this solemn injunction, addressed to the people of the United States: "Let it be remembered that it has ever been the pride and boast of America, that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature."

No one will contend that our fathers, after effecting the Revolution and the independence of their country by proclaiming this system of beneficent political philosophy, established an entirely different one in the constitution assigned to its government. This philosophy, then, is the basis of the American constitution.

It is moreover a true philosophy, deduced from the nature of man and the character of the Creator. If there were no supreme law, then the world would be a scene of universal anarchy, resulting from the eternal conflict of peculiar institutions and antagonistic laws. There being such a universal law, if any human constitutions and laws differing from it could have any authority, then that universal law could not be supreme. That supreme law is necessarily based on the equality of nations, of races, and of men. It is a simple, self-evident basis. One nation, race, or individual, may not oppress or injure another, because the safety and welfare of each is essential to the common safety and welfare of all. If all are not equal and free, then who is entitled to be free, and what evidence of his superiority can he bring from nature or revelation? All men necessarily have a common interest in the promulgation and maintenance of these principles, because it is equally in the nature of men to be content with the enjoyment of their just rights, and to be discontented under the privation of them. Just so far as these principles practically prevail, the stringency of government is safely relaxed, and peace and harmony obtained. But men cannot maintain these principles, or even comprehend them, without a very considerable advance in knowledge and virtue. The law of nations, designed to preserve peace among mankind, was unknown to the ancients. It has been perfected in our own times by means of the more general dissemination of knowledge and practice of the virtues inculcated by Christianity. To disseminate knowledge and to increase virtue therefore among men, is to establish and maintain the principles on which the recovery and preservation of their inherent natural rights

depend, and the state that does this most faithfully, advances most effectually the common cause of human nature.

For myself, I am sure that this cause is not a dream, but a reality. Have not all men consciousness of a property in the memory of human transactions available for the same great purposes, the security of their individual rights and the perfection of their individual happiness? Have not all men a consciousness of the same equal interest in the achievements of invention, in the instructions of philosophy, and in the solaces of music and the arts? And do not these achievements, instructions, and solaces, exert everywhere the same influences, and produce the same emotions in the bosoms of all men? Since all languages are convertible into each other by correspondence with the same agents, objects, actions, and emotions, have not all men practically one common language? Since the constitutions and laws of all societies are only so many various definitions of the rights and duties of men, as those rights and duties are learned from nature and revelation, have not all men practically one code of moral duty? Since the religious of men in their various climes are only so many different forms of their devotion toward a Supreme and Almighty Power entitled to their reverence and receiving it under the various names of Jehovah, Jove, and Lord, have not all men practically one religion? Since all men are seeking liberty and happiness for a season here, and to deserve and so to secure more perfect liberty and happiness somewhere in a future world, and since they all substantially agree that these temporal and spiritual objects are to be attained only through the knowledge of truth and the practice of virtue, have not mankind practically one common pursuit, through one common way, of one common and equal hope and destiny?

If there had been no such common humanity as I have insisted upon, then the American people would not have enjoyed the sympathies of mankind when establishing institutions of civil and religious liberty here, nor would their establishment here have awakened in the nations of Europe and of South America desires and hopes of similar institutions there. If there had been no such common humanity, then we should not, ever since the American Revolution, have seen human society throughout the world divided into two parties, the high and the low—the one perpetually fore-

boding and earnestly hoping the downfall, and the other as confidently predicting and as sincerely desiring the durability, of republican institutions. If there had been no such common humanity, then we should not have seen this tide of emigration from insular and continental Europe, flowing into our country through the channels of the St. Lawrence, the Hudson, and the Mississippi—ebbing, however, always with the occasional rise of the hopes of freedom abroad, and always swelling again into greater volume when those premature hopes subside. If there were no such common humanity, then the peasantry and poor of Great Britain would not be perpetually appealing to us against the oppression of landlords on their farms and workmasters in their manufactories and mines; and so, on the other hand, we should not be, as we are now, perpetually framing apologies to mankind for the continuance of African slavery among ourselves. If there were no such common humanity, then the fame of Wallace would have long ago died away in his native mountains, and the name even of Washington would at most have been only a household word in Virginia, and not, as it is now, a watchword of hope and progress throughout the world.

If there had been no such common humanity, then when the civilization of Greece and Rome had been consumed by the fires of human passion, the nations of modern Europe could never have gathered from among its ashes the philosophy, the arts, and the religion, which were imperishable, and have reconstructed with those materials that better civilization which, amid the conflicts and fall of political and ecclesiastical systems, has been constantly advancing toward perfection in every age. If there had been no such common humanity, then the dark and massive Egyptian obelisk would not have everywhere reappeared in the sepulchral architecture of our own times, and the light and graceful orders of Greece and Italy would not, as now, have been the models of our villas and our dwellings, nor would the simple and lofty arch and the delicate tracery of Gothic design have been, as it now is, everywhere consecrated to the service of religion.

If there had been no such common humanity, then would the sense of the obligation of the Decalogue have been confined to the despised nation who received it from Mount Sinai, and the prophecies of Jewish seers and the songs of Jewish bards would have perished forever

with their temple, and never afterward could they have become, as they now are, the universal utterance of the spiritual emotions and hopes of mankind. If there had been no such common humanity, then certainly Europe and Africa and even new America would not, after the lapse of centuries, have recognised a common Redeemer from all the sufferings and perils of human life in a culprit who had been ignominiously executed in the obscure Roman province of Judea; nor would Europe have ever gone up in arms to Palestine to wrest from the unbelieving Turk the tomb where that culprit had slept for only three days and nights after his descent from the cross; much less would his traditionary instructions, preserved by fishermen and publicans, have become the chief agency in the renovation of human society through after-coming ages.

But although this philosophy is undeniably true, yet it would be a great error to believe that it has ever been, or is likely soon to be, universally accepted. Mankind accept philosophy just in proportion as intellectual and moral cultivation enable them to look through proximate to ultimate consequences. While they are deficient in that cultivation, peace and order, essential to the very existence of society, are necessarily maintained by force. Those who employ that force seek to perpetuate their power, and they do this most effectually by dividing classes and castes, races and nations, and arraying them for mutual injury or destruction against each other. Despotism effects and perpetuates this division by unequal laws, subversive of those of reason and of God. Moreover, a common instinct of fear combines the oppressors of all nations in a league against the advance of that political philosophy which comes to liberate mankind. Those who inculcate this philosophy, therefore, necessarily encounter opposition and expose themselves to danger; and insomuch as they labor from convictions of duty and motives of benevolence, with such hazards of personal safety, their principles and characters are justly regarded as heroic. Adams, Hamilton, La Fayette, Knox, and Washington, although they were the champions of human nature—a cause dear to all men—were saved from the revolutionary scaffold only by the success of their treason against a king whom the very necessities of society required to reign. Milton's "Defence of the People of England," which was in truth a promulgation of the same philosophy which we have been examining, was burned by

the public executioner, and its immortal author only by good fortune escaped the same punishment. The American colonists derived this philosophy chiefly from the instructions of Locke, Sidney and Vane. Locke fled into exile, and Sidney and Vane perished as felons. Cicero, an earlier professor of the same philosophy, fell on the sword of a public assassin, and Socrates, who first inculcated it, drank the fatal hemlock, under a judicial sentence in the jail of Athens.

Still this philosophy, although heroic, is by no means, therefore, to be regarded as unnecessary and visionary. The true heroic in human thought and conduct is only the useful in the higher regions of speculation and activity. If republicanism, or purely popular government, is the only form of political constitution which permits the development of liberty and equality, which are only other names for political justice, and if republicanism can only be established by the overthrow of despotism, then this philosophy is absolutely necessary to effect the freedom of mankind. All citizens of this republic agree with us thus far. But with many this is rather a speculation than a vital faith, and so they hesitate to allow full activity to the principles thus acknowledged, through fear of disturbing the harmony of society and the peace of the world. Nevertheless, it is clear that the same philosophy which brings republican institutions into existence must be exclusively relied upon to defend and perpetuate them. A tree may indeed stand and grow and flourish for many seasons, although it is unsound at the heart; but just because it is so unsound, its leaves will ultimately wither, its branches will fall, and its trunk will decay. It is only the house that is built upon the rock that can surely and forever defy the tempests and the waves. The founders of this republic knew this great truth right well, for they said: "If justice, good faith, honor, gratitude, and all the other qualities which ennoble a nation and fulfill the ends of government, shall be the fruits of our establishments, then the cause of liberty will acquire a dignity and a lustre which it has never yet enjoyed, and an example will be set which cannot but have the most favorable influence on mankind. If, on the other side, our governments should be unfortunately blotted with the reverse of these cardinal virtues, then the great cause which we have engaged to vindicate will be dishonored and betrayed. The last and fairest experiment of human nature will be turned against them, and

their patrons and friends will be silenced by the insults of the votaries of tyranny and oppression."[1]

The example of Rome is often commended to us for our emulation. Let us consider it then with becoming care. Rome had indeed forms of religion and morals, a show of philosophy and the arts, but in none of these was there more than the faintest recognition of a universal humanity. Her predecessor, Greece, had, in a brilliant but brief and precocious career, invented the worship of nature, or, in other words, the worship of deities, which were only names given to the discovered forces of nature. This religion did not indeed exalt the human mind to a just conception of the Divine, but, on the other hand, it did not altogether consign it to the sphere of sensuality. Rome unfortunately rejected even this poor religion, because it was foreign and because it was too spiritual; and in its stead she established one which practically was the worship of the state itself. The senate elected gods for Rome, and these were expected to reward that distinguished partiality by showing peculiar and discriminating favor to the people of Rome, and the same political authority appointed creed, precepts, ritual and priesthood. Does it need amplification to show what the character of the creed, the precepts, the ritual and the priesthood, thus established, necessarily were? All were equally licentious and corrupt.

As was the religion, so of course were the morals of Rome. Ambition was the sole motive of the state. At first every town in Italy, and afterwards every nation, however remote, was regarded as an enemy to be conquered, not in retaliation for any injuries received, nor even for the purpose of amending its barbarous institutions and laws, but to be despoiled and enslaved, that Rome might be rich and might occupy the world alone. Fraud, duplicity and treachery might be practised against the foreigner, and every form of cruelty might be inflicted upon the captive who had resisted in self-defense or in defense of his county. Military valor not only became the highest of virtues but exclusively usurped the name of virtue. The act of parricide was the highest of crimes, not however because of its gross inhumanity, but because by a legal fiction the father was a sacred type of the Roman state. The sway of Rome, as it spread over the world as then known, nevertheless gravitated toward the

1 Address of the Continental Congress, 1789.

city and centred in the order of Patricians. The Plebeians were degraded and despised because their ancestors were immigrants. Below the Plebeians there was yet a lower order, consisting of prisoners-of-war and their offspring, always numerous enough to endanger the safety of the state. These were slaves, and the code of domestic servitude established for the captured Africans and their descendants in some parts of our own country is a meliorated edition of that which Rome maintained for the government of slaves as various in nation, language and religion, as the enemies she conquered. These orders, mutally hostile and aggressive, were kept asunder by discriminating laws and carefully-cherished prejudices. The Patricians divided the public domain among themselves, although Plebeian blood was shed as profusely as their own in acquiring it. The Patricians alone administered justice, and they even kept the forms of its administration a profound mystery sealed against the knowledge of those for whose safety and welfare the laws existed. The Plebeian could approach the courts only as a client in the footsteps of a Patrician patron; and for his aid in obtaining that justice, which of course was an absolute debt of the state, the Patrician was entitled to the support of his client in every enterprise of personal interest and ambition. Thus did Rome, while enslaving the world, blindly prepare the machinery for her own overthow by the agency of domestic factions. Industry in Rome was dishonored. The Plebeians labored with the slaves. Patricians scorned all employments but that of agriculture and the service of the state. And so Rome rejected commerce and the arts. The person of the Patrician was inviolable, while the Plebeian forfeited liberty and for a long period even life by the failure to pay debts which his very necessities obliged him to contract. The slaves held their lives by the tenure of their masters' forbearance, and what that forbearance was we learn from the fact that they arrayed the slaves against each other, when trained as gladiators, in mortal combat for the gratification of their own pride and the amusement of the people. Punishments were graduated, not by the inherent turpitude of the crimes committed, nor by the injury or danger resulting from them to the state, but by the rank of the offender. What was that Roman liberty of which, in such general and captivating descriptions, we read so much? The Patrician enjoyed a licentious freedom, the Plebeian an uncertain

and humiliating one, extorted from the higher order by perpetual practices of sedition. According to the modern understanding of popular rights and character, there was no people in Rome. So at least we learn from Cicero: "*Non est enim consilium in vulgo. Non ratio, non discrimen, non diligentia. Semperque sapienter ea quæ populus ferenda non laudanda.*"

The domestic affections were stifled in that wild society. The wife was a slave and might be beaten, transferred to another lord, or divorced at pleasure. The father slew his children whenever their care and support became irksome, and the state approved the act. In such a society the rich and great of course grew always richer and greater, and the poor and low always poorer and more debased; and yet throughout all her long career did Rome never establish one public charity, nor has history preserved any memorable instances of private benevolence. Such was the life of Rome under her kings and consuls. She attained the end of her ambition, and became, as her historian truly boasts, "*Populus Romanus victor dominusque omnium gentium.*" But at the same time the city trembled always at the very breathing of popular discontent, and every citizen and even the senate, generals and consuls, were every hour the slaves of superstitious fears of the withdrawal of the favor of the gods. The people, sighing for milder and more genial laws, after the lapse of many centuries, recovered the lost code which the good king Numa had received from the goddess Egeria. Do we wonder that the senate interdicted its publication, lest it might produce agitation dangerous to the public peace? Or can we be surprised when we read that Cicero, whose philosophy was only less than divine, when he found that the republic was actually falling into ruins, implored his new academy to be silent?

You know well the prolonged but fearful catastrophe, the civil and the servile wars, the dictatorship, the usurpation, the empire, the military despotism, the insurrections in the provinces, the invasion by barbarians, the division and the dismemberment and the fall of the state, the extinction of the Roman name, language and laws, and the destruction of society, and even civilization itself, not only in Italy, but throughout the world, and the consequent darkness which overshadowed the earth throughout seven centuries. This is the

moral of a state whose material life is stimulated and perfected, while its spiritual life is neglected and extinguished.

And now it is seen that the future which we ought to desire for our country involves besides merely physical prosperity and aggrandizement, corresponding intellectual development and advancement in virtue also. Has our spiritual life hitherto improved equally with our material growth?

It is not easy to answer the question. We were at first a small and nearly a homogeneous people. We are now eight times more numerous, and we have incorporated large and various foreign elements in our society. We were originally a rural and agricultural people. Now one-seventh of our population is found in manufacturing towns and commercial cities. We then were poor, and lived in constant apprehension of domestic disorder and of foreign danger, and we were at the same time distrustful of the capacity and stability of our novel institutions. We are now relatively rich, and all those doubts and fears have vanished. We must make allowance for this great change of circumstances, and we must remember also that it is the character of the great mass of society now existing that is to be compared with, not the heroic models of the revolutionary age, but with society at large as it then existed.

It is certain that society has not declined. Religion has, indeed, lost some of its ancient austerity, but, waiving the question whether asceticism is a just test of religion, we may safely say that the change which has occurred is only a compromise with foreign elements of religion; for who will deny that those elements are purer and more spiritual here than the systems existing abroad from which they have been derived? Nor can it be denied that, while the ecclesiastical systems existing among us have been, with even more than our rigorous early jealousy, kept distinct and separate from the political conduct of the state, religious institutions have been multiplied relatively with the advance of settlement and population, and are everywhere well and effectually sustained. At the era of independence we had little intellectual reputation, except what a bold and successful metaphysician and a vigorous explorer in natural philosophy had won for us. We have now, I think, a recognized and respectable rank in the republic of letters. It is true, indeed, that we have produced few great works in speculative science and polite literature; but those

are not the departments which, during the last half century, have chiefly engaged the human mind. A long season of political reform and recovery from exhausting wars has necessarily required intellectual activity in reducing into use the discoveries before made; and we may justly claim that, in applying the elements of science to the improvement and advancement of agriculture, art, and commerce, we have not been surpassed.

I do not seek to disguise from myself, nor from you, the existence of a growing passion for territorial aggrandizement, which often exhibits a gross disregard of justice and humanity. Nevertheless, I am not one of those who think that the temper of the nation has become already unsettled. Accidents favoring the indulgence of that passion, have been met with a degree of self-denial that no other nation ever practised. Aggrandizement has been incidental, while society has, nevertheless, bestowed its chief care on developments of natural resources, reforms of political constitutions, melioration of codes, the diffusion of knowledge, and the cultivation of virtue. If this benign policy has been chiefly exercised within the domain of state authority, and has not reached our federal system, the explanation is obvious in the facts that the popular will is, by virtue of the federal constitution, slower in reaching that system, and that we inherited fears which seemed patriotic, of the danger of severance of the Union, to result from innovation. If we have not, in the federal government, forsaken, as widely as we ought to have done, systems of administration borrowed from countries where liberty was either unknown or was greatly abridged, and so have maintained armies, and navies, and diplomacy, on a scale of unnecessary grandeur and ostentation, it can hardly be contended that they have, in any great degree, corrupted the public virtue. Inquiry is now more active than it has heretofore been, and it may not be doubted that the federal action will hereafter, though with such moderation as will produce no danger and justify no alarm, be made to conform to the sentiments of prudence, enterprise, justice, and humanity, which prevail among the people.

Looking through the states which formed the confederacy in its beginning, we find, as general facts, that public order has been effectually maintained, public faith has been preserved, and public tranquillity has been undisturbed, that justice has everywhere been regu-

larly administered, and generally with impartiality. We have established a system of education, which, it is true, is surpassed by many European institutions in regard to the instruction afforded, but which, nevertheless, is far more equal and universal in regard to the masses which are educated; and we are beginning to see that system adapted equally to the education of both sexes, and of all races, which is a feature altogether new even in modern civilization, and promises the most auspicious results to the cause of liberty and virtue. Our literature half a century ago was altogether ephemeral, and scarcely formed an element of moral or political influence. It is now marked with our own national principles and sentiments, and exerts every day an increasing influence on the national mind. The journalist press, originally a feeble institution, often engaged in exciting the passions and alarming the fears of society, and dividing it into uncompromising and unforgiving factions, has been constantly assuming a higher tone of morality and more patriotic and humane principles of action. There are, indeed, gross abuses of the power of suffrage, but still our popular elections, on the whole, express the will of the people, and are even less influenced by authority, prejudice and passion, than heretofore. Slavery, an institution that was at first quite universal, has now come to be acknowledged as a peculiar one, existing in only a portion of the states. And if, as I doubt not, you, like myself, are impatient of its continuance, then you will nevertheless find ground for much satisfaction in the fact that the foreign slave trade has been already, by unanimous consent of all the states, condemned and repudiated; that manumission has been effected in half of the states; and that, notwithstanding the great political influence which the institution has been able to organize, a healthful, constant, and growing public sentiment, nourished by the suggestions of sound economy and the instincts of justice and humanity, is leading the way with marked advance toward a complete and universal, though just and peaceful emancipation.

It must be borne in mind, now, that all this moral and social improvement has been effected, not by the exercise of any authority over the people, but by the people themselves, acting with freedom from all except self-imposed restraints.

Of the new states, it is happily true that they have, almost without exception, voluntarily organized their governments according to

the most perfect models furnished by the elder members of the confederacy, and that they have uniformly maintained law, order, and faith, while they have, with wonderful forecast, been even more munificent than the elder states in laying broad foundations of liberty and virtue. On the whole, we think that we may claim that, under the republican system established here, the people have governed themselves safely and wisely, and have enjoyed a greater amount of prosperity and happiness than, under any form of constitution, was ever before or elsewhere vouchsafed to any portion of mankind.

Nevertheless, this review proves only that the measure of knowledge and virtue we possess is equal to the exigency of the republic under the circumstances in which it was organized. Those circumstances are passing away, and we are entering a career of wealth, power, and expansion. In that career, it is manifest that we shall need higher intellectual attainments and greater virtue as a nation than we have hitherto possessed, or else there is no adaptation of means to ends in the scheme of the Divine government. Nay, we shall need, in this new emergency, intellect and virtue surpassing those of the honored founders of the republic. I am aware that this proposition will seem to you equally unreasonable and irreverent. Nevertheless, you will, on a moment's reflection, admit its truth. Did the invention of the nation stop with the discoveries of Fulton and Franklin? On the contrary, those philosophers, if they could now revisit the earth, would bow to the genius which has perfected the steam engine and the telegraph with a homage as profound as that with which we honor their own great memories. So I think Jefferson, and even Washington, under the same circumstances, instead of accusing us of degeneracy, would be lost in admiration of the extent and perfection to which we have safely carried in practice the theory of self-government which they established amid so much uncertainty, and bequeathed to us with so much distrust. Shall we acquit ourselves of obligation if we rest content with either the achievements, the intelligence, or the virtue of our ancestors? If so, then the prospect of mankind is hopeless indeed, for then it must be true that not only is there an impassable stage of social perfection, but that we have reached it, and that, henceforth, not only we, but all mankind, must recede from it, and civilization must everywhere decline. Such a hypothesis does violence to every power of the

human mind, and every hope of the human heart. Moreover, these energies and aspirations are the forces of a divine nature within us, and to admit that they can be stifled and suppressed, is to contradict the manifest purposes of human existence. Yet it will be quite absurd to claim that we are fulfilling these purposes, if we shall fail to produce hereafter benefactors of our race equal to Fulton, and Franklin, and Adams, and even Washington. Let us hold these honored characters indeed as models, but not of unapproachable perfection. Let us, on the contrary, weigh and fully understand our great responsibilities. It is well that we can rejoice in the renown of a Cooper, an Irving, and a Bancroft; but we have yet to give birth to a Shakspeare, a Milton, and a Bacon. The fame of Patrick Henry and John Adams may suffice for the past; but the world will yet demand of us a Burke and a Demosthenes. We may repose for the present upon the fame of Morse and Fulton and Franklin; but human society is entitled to look to us, ere long, for a Des Cartes and a Newton. If we disappoint these expectations, and acknowledge ourselves unequal to them, then how shall it be made to appear that freedom is better than slavery, and republicanism more conducive to the welfare of mankind than despotism? To cherish aspirations humbler than these, is equally to shrink from our responsibilities and to dishonor the memory of the ancestors we so justly revere.

And now I am sure that your hearts will sink into some depth of despondency when I ask whether American society now exhibits the influences of these higher but necessary aspirations? I think that everywhere there is confessed a decline from the bold and stern virtue which, at some previous time, was inculcated and practised in executive councils and in representative chambers. I think that we all are conscious that recently we have met questions of momentous responsibility, in the organization of governments over our newly acquired territories, and appeals to our sympathy and aid for oppressed nations abroad, in a spirit of timidity and of compromise. I think that we all are conscious of having abandoned something of our high morality, in suffering important posts of public service, at home and abroad, to fall sometimes into the hands of mercenary men, destitute of true republican spirit, and of generous aspirations to promote the welfare of our country and of mankind:

> "Souls that no hope of future praise inflame,
> Cold and insensible to glorious fame."

I think that we are accustomed to excuse the national demoralization which has produced these results, on the ground that the practice of a sterner virtue might have disturbed the harmony of society, and endangered the safety of that fabric of union on which all our hopes depend. In this, we forget that a nation must always recede if it be not actually advancing; that, as hope is the element of progress, so fear, admitted into public counsels, betrays like treason.

But there is, nevertheless, no sufficient reason for the distrust of the national virtue. Moral forces are, like material forces, subject to conflict and reäction. It is only through successive reäctions that knowledge and virtue advance. The great conservative and restorative forces of society still remain, and are acquiring, all the while, even greater vigor than they have ever heretofore exercised. Whether I am right or not in this opinion, all will agree that an increase of popular intelligence and a renewal of public virtue are necessary. This is saying nothing new, for it is a maxim of political science that all nations must continually advance in knowledge and renew their constitutional virtues, or must perish. I am sure that we shall do this, because I am sure that our great capacity for advancing the welfare of mankind has not yet been exhausted, and that the promises we have given to the cause of humanity will not be suffered to fail by Him who overrules all human events to the promotion of that cause.

But where is the agency that is to work out these so necessary results? Shall we look to the press? Yes, we may hope much from the press, for it is free. It can safely inculcate truth and expose prejudice, error, and injustice. The press, moreover, is strong in its perfect mechanism, and it reaches every mind throughout this vast and ever-widening confederacy. But the press must have editors and authors—men possessing talents, education, and virtue, and so qualified to instruct, enlighten, and guide the people.

Shall we look to the sacred desk? Yes, indeed; for it is of divine institution, and is approved by human experience. The ministers of Christ, inculcating divine morals, under divine authority, with divine sanctions, and sustained and aided by special coöperating influences of the Divine Spirit, are now carrying farther and broadly onward the great work of the renewal of the civilization of the world, and its emancipation from superstition and despotism. But the desk,

also, must have ministers—men possessing talents, education, and virtue, and so qualified to enlighten, instruct, and guide mankind.

But however well the press, the desk, and the popular tribune, may be qualified to instruct and elevate the people, their success and consequently their influence must after all depend largely on the measure of intelligence and virtue possessed by the people when sufficiently matured to receive their instructions. Editors, authors, ministers, statesmen, and people, all are qualified for their respective posts of duty in the institutions of popular education, and the standard of these is established by that which is recognized among us by the various names of the academy, the college, and the university. We see, then, that the university holds a chief place among the institutions of the American Republic.

I may not attempt to specify at large what the university ought to teach or how it ought to impart its instructions. That has been confided to abler and more practical hands. But I may venture to insist on the necessity of having the standard of moral duty maintained at its just height by the university. That institution must be rich and full in the knowledge of the sciences which it imparts, but this is not of itself enough. It must imbue the national mind with correct convictions of the greatness and excellence to which it ought to aspire. To do this it must accustom the public mind to look beyond the mere temporary consequences of actions and events to their ultimate influence on the direction of the republic and on the progress of mankind. So it will enable men to decide between prejudice and reason, expediency and duty, the demagogue and the statesman, the bigot and the Christian.

The standard which the university shall establish must correspond to the principles of eternal truth and equal justice. The university must be conservative. It must hold fast every just principle of moral and political science that the experience of mankind has approved, but it must also be bold, remembering that in every human system there are always political superstitions upholding physical slavery in some of its modes, as there are always religious superstitions upholding intellectual slavery in some of its forms; that all these superstitions stand upon prescriptions, and that they can only be exploded where opinion is left free, and reason is ever active and vigorous. But the university must nevertheless practice and teach

moderation and charity even to error, remembering that involuntary error will necessarily be mingled also even with its own best instructions, that unbridled zeal overreaches and defeats itself, and that he who would conquer in moral discussion, like him who would prevail in athletic games, must be temperate in all things.

Reverend Instructors and Benevolent Founders, this new institution, by reason of its location in the centre of Ohio, itself a central one among these thirty-one united communities, must exert an influence that can scarcely be conceived, now, upon the welfare and fame of our common country. Devote it then, I pray you, to no mere partisan or sectarian objects. Remember that the patriot and the Christian is a partisan or a sectarian, only because the constitution of society allows him no other mode of efficient and beneficent activity. Let "Capitol University" be dedicated not to the interests of the beautiful city which it adorns, nor even to the interests of the great and prosperous state whose patronage I hope it will largely enjoy, nor even to the republic of which I trust it is destined to become a tower of strength and support. On the contrary, if you would make it promote most effectually all these precious interests, dedicate it, I enjoin upon you, as our forefathers dedicated all the institutions which they established, to the cause of Human Nature.

THE TRUE BASIS OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.[1]

FELLOW CITIZENS: I do not know how lightly you, who are hurried so fast through the ever-changing panorama of metropolitan life, may regard the quiet scenes of this unpretending festival, appointed and arranged with so much care by the American Institute; but I confess for myself, that, coming from a distant and rural home, and so being never more than an occasional spectator here, I find always the same first freshness, in these autumnal shows of flowers, and fruits, and animals of subsistence, fleece and burden, trained and perfected by hard yet gentle hands; and that these annual trials of the skill of emulous, yet unambitious men and women, in the use of the spade and the plow, the forge and the furnace, the dairy and the needle, the spindle and the loom, innocent in their nature, yet beneficent in their effect, by stimulating invention and enterprise, while they faithfully mark, as years roll on, the progress which our country is making in arts and civilization, never fail to excite within me sympathies and emotions more profound and pleasing than any state pageant which I have witnessed at home, or the most imposing demonstration of military power that can be seen in any other and less favored land.

Society divides concerning that progress. Those who are occupied with their own personal cares, and apprehensive of evil in every change, look upon it with indifference or distrust; others, knowing that in a republic, constituted as this is, there exists always a restless activity toward either peace or war, virtue or vice, greatness or shame, devote themselves to the duty of regulating that activity, and giving it a right direction.

The members of the American Institute are of this class. Having constantly sympathized with them heretofore, when their unremitted labors secured neither rewards nor favor, I rejoice in meeting them now, under more propitious circumstances. I congratulate you,

[1] An Address before the American Institute, New York, October 20, 1853.

Messrs. Reese, Livingston and Hall, Stillman, Meigs and Chandler, and others, associates, that your institution has been adopted as a model by many towns, and by all the counties in this state, by the state itself, and by many other states; and that your instructions and example, patiently continued through so many years, have at last induced the nation itself to consent to appear, and to win some significant trophies, in the Exhibition of Universal Industry, already held in London, and to inaugurate another and brilliant one in the world's new capital, which we are founding on this yet rude coast of a recently impassable ocean.

Nevertheless, I have been for many reasons habitually averse from mingling in the sometimes excited debates which crowd upon each other in a great city. There was, however, an authority which I could not disobey, in the venerable name and almost paternal kindness of the eminent citizen, who so recently presided here with dignity and serenity all his own; and who transmitted to me the invitation of the Institute, and persuaded its acceptance!

How sudden his death! Only three weeks ago the morning mail brought to me his announcement of his arrival to arrange this exhibition, and his summons to me to join him here; and the evening dispatch, on the self-same day, bore the painful intelligence that the lofty genius which had communed with kindred spirits so long, on the interests of his country, had departed from the earth, and that the majestic form which had been animated by it, had disappeared forever from among living men.

I had disciplined myself when coming here, so as to purpose to speak no word for the cause of human freedom, lest what might seem too persistent an advocacy might offend. But must I, therefore, abridge of its just proportions the eulogium which the occasion and the character of the honored dead alike demand?

The first ballot which I cast for the chief magistracy of my native and most beloved state, bore the name of James Tallmadge as the alternate of De Witt Clinton. If I have never faltered in pursuing the policy of that immortal statesman, through loud reproach and vindictive opposition during his life, and amid clamors and contentions, often amounting almost to faction, since his death, I have found as little occasion to hesitate or waver in adhering to the counsels and example of the illustrious compeer who, after surviving him so many years, has now been removed, in ripened age, to the companionship

of the just. How does not time vindicate fidelity to truth and to our country! A vote for Clinton and Tallmadge in 1824, what censures did it not bring then? Who will impeach *that* ballot now?

A statesman's claim to the gratitude of his country rests on what were, or what would have been, the results of the policy he has recommended. If the counsels of James Tallmadge had completely prevailed, then not only would American forests, mines, soil, invention and industry have rendered our country, now and forever, independent of all other nations, except for what climate forbids; but then, also, no menial hand would ever have guided a plow, and no footstep of a slave would ever have been tracked on the soil of all that vast part of our national domain that stretches away from the banks of the Mississippi to the far western ocean.

This was the policy of James Tallmadge. It was worthy of New York, in whose name it was promulgated. It would have been noble, even to have altogether failed in establishing it. He was successful, however, in part through—only through—unwise delays and unnecessary compromises, which he strenuously opposed, and which, therefore, have not impaired his just fame. And so in the end, he, more nearly than any other citizen of our time, realized the description of the happiest man in the world, given to the frivolous Crœsus by the great Athenian: "He saw his offspring, and they all survived him. At the close of an honorable and prosperous life, on the field of civic victory, he was rewarded with the honors of a public funeral by the state that he had enriched, adorned, and enlarged."

Gentlemen of the American Institute, Dr. Johnson truly said, that the first man who balanced a straw on his nose; the first man who rode three horses at a time; in short, all such men deserved the applause of mankind, on account, not of the use of what they did, but of the dexterity which they exhibited; for that everything which enlarged the sphere of human powers, and showed man that he could do what he thought he could not do, was valuable. I apprehend that this is a true exposition of the philosophy of your own most useful labors.

The increase of personal power and skill diminishes individual dependence; and individual independence, when it pervades the whole state, is national independence. It is only when, through such individuality of its members, a nation attains a certain independence, that it passes from that condition of society in which it thinks, moves,

and acts, whether for peace or for war, for right or for wrong, according to the interests or caprices of one, or of a few persons (a condition which defines monarchy, or aristocracy), to that better condition in which it thinks, moves, and acts, in all things, under the direction of one common interest, ascertained and determined by the intelligent consent of a majority, or all of its members; which condition constitutes a republic, or democracy. So democracy, wherever it exists, is more or less perfect, and, of course, more or less safe and strong, according to the tone of individuality maintained by its citizens.

Of all men, and of all nations, it seems to me that Americans, and this republic, have at once the least excuse for a want of independence, and the most need for assuming and maintaining it.

No other nation has equal elements of society and of empire. Charlemagne, when founding his kingdom, saw, or might have seen, that, while it was confined by the ocean and by the Mediterranean on the west and on the south, it was equally shut in northerly and eastwardly by river and mountain barriers, which would be successfully maintained forever, by races as vigorous and as independent as the Franks themselves. Alfred the Great saw so clearly how his country was circumscribed by the seas, that he never once thought of continental empire. The future careers of France and England may, like the past, be filled up with spasmodic efforts to enlarge fixed dominions by military conquests and agricultural and commercial colonies; but all such attempts, even if they should be as gigantic as those which have heretofore been made, will, like them, be followed by disastrous reïctions, bringing the nations back again, and confining them at last within their natural and earliest borders. No political system can be held together permanently by force, suspending or overpowering the laws of political affinity and gravitation. Unlike those nations, we are a homogeneous people, occupying a compact and indivisible domain, peculiarly adapted to internal commerce, seventeen times greater than that of France, and an hundred times more extended than that of Great Britain. While it spreads eastward and westward across the continent, nature has not interposed, nor has man erected, nor can he raise, a barrier on the north or on the south, that can prevent any expansion that shall be found necessary, provided only that our efforts to effect it shall be, as they ought to be, wise, peaceful, and magnanimous. Only Russia excels us in territorial greatness. But while all of her vast population are not

merely willing, but even superstitious subjects, of an unmitigated despotism, more than four-fifths of them are predial slaves. If such a population could, within any short period, rise up to a state of comparative social elevation, such a change would immediately lead to seditions that must inevitably result in dismemberment of the empire.

Why should we go abroad for mineral materials, or for metallic treasures, since this broad domain of ours is, even more plentifully than any equal portion of the earth, stored with marl, gypsum, salt, coal, quicksilver, lead, copper, iron, and gold? Where shall we find quarries and forests, producing more amply the materials for architecture, whether for the purposes of peace, or of war on land or on sea? Our cities may be built of our own freestone, marble and granite; and our southern coasts are fringed with pine and live-oak, while timber and lumber, diversified and exhaustless, crown our northern mountains and plains.

Why should we resort to other soils and climates for supplies of subsistence, if we except spices, dyes, and some not indispensable tropical fruits, since we have sugar, rice and cotton fields stretching along the shore of the gulf, long mountain ranges, such as those of Virginia and Vermont, declivities in which the vine delights, along the banks of the Ohio, and the endless prairies, fertile in all cereal grains, tobacco, flax and hemp, that border the lakes and the Mississippi, and their widely-branching and far-reaching inlets and tributaries?

If there is virtue in blood, what nation traces its lineage to purer and gentler stocks? And what nation increases in numbers, by either immigration or by native births, more rapidly? And what nation, moreover, has risen in intelligence equally or so fast?

If it be asked whether we have spirit and vigor proportioned to our natural resources, I answer, look at these thirteen original states. Their vigor is not only unimpaired, but it is increasing. Then look at the eighteen others, offshoots of those stocks. They are even more elastic and thrifty. Consider how small and how recently planted were the germs of all this political luxuriance, and to what early hardships and neglect they were exposed. Can we not reasonably look for a maturity full of strength and majesty?

Moreover, the circumstances of the age are propitious to us. The nations on this continent are new, youthful and fraternal, while those

existing on the other are either lying in hopeless debasement or are preparing to undergo the convulsions of an indispensable regeneration. What power, then, need we fear? What power, if we were in danger, could yield us protection, or even aid?

While our constitutions and laws establish political equality, they operate to produce social equality also, by preventing monopolies of land and great accumulation of wealth; and so they afford incentives to universal activity and emulation. Why, then, should not the American citizen and the American republic be consciously independent in all things, as in all things they are safe and free?

Such independence should be attained and preserved, not by a few only, but, as far as possible, by all citizens. It is not less essential that the farmer, the mechanic, and the laborer shall enjoy it, than that it shall regulate the action of the merchant, the lawyer, and the statesman. Every member of the state may become a soldier, and even a senator. He can never be less than an elector. What does not the republic owe to Sherman and Franklin? Yet they were mechanics. What would not have been its fate but for the independence of the captors of Andre? Yet, Paulding, Williams, and Van Wart were mere laboring men.

Virtue is confessedly the vital principle of the republic; but virtue cannot exist without courage, which is only the consciousness of independence.

We are bound to recommend republican institutions to the acceptance of other nations. Can we do so, if we are content to be no wiser, no more virtuous, no more useful to humanity, than those to whom such institutions are denied? Responsibility is always in proportion to the talent enjoyed. Neither man nor nation can be wise or really virtuous, or useful, when dependent on the caprice or even on the favor of another. Is there one among the tens of thousands of inventions in the patent office that was made by a slave, or even by one whose blood had been recently attainted by slavery? Peter the Great, master of so many millions of slaves, resorted to the shop of a free mechanic of Saardam to learn the mystery of shipbuilding. His successor, Nicholas, employs Whistler, a Massachusetts engineer, to project his railroads; Ross Winans, a Baltimore mechanic, to construct his locomotives; and Orsamus Eaton, a carriage-maker of Troy, to construct his cars. Do you wonder that

loving freedom for such fruits, I also have set my face firmly against slavery?

If we act hereafter as we have acted hitherto, we shall be continually changing old things, old laws, old customs and even old constitutions, for new ones. Does any one doubt this? Have we not already a third constitution in this state? Has any one of the states a constitution older than twenty-five years? But political progress, if not regulated with moderation, may move too fast; and if not wisely guided will lead to ruin. It is the people themselves, and not any power above or aside from them, that alone must regulate and direct that progress. Be they never so honest, they cannot discharge so great a political trust wisely, except they act on such generous impulses, and with such lofty purposes, as only bold and independent men can conceive. The people must be independent, or this republic, like the republics that have gone before it, must be ruled and ruined by demagogues.

I am far from supposing that we are signally deficient in independence. I know that it is a national, a hereditary and a popular sentiment; that we annually celebrate, and always glory in our independence. We do so justly, for nowhere else does even a form or shadow of popular independence exist; while here it is the very rock on which our institutions rest. Nevertheless, occasions for the exercise of this virtue may be neglected.

We hold in contempt, equally just and profound, him who imposes, and him who wears a menial livery; and yet, I think, that we are accustomed to regard with no great severity, the employer who exacts, or the mechanic, clerk or laborer, who yields political conformity in consideration of wages. We insist, as we ought, that every citizen in the state shall be qualified by education for citizenship; but we are by no means unanimous that one citizen, or class of citizens, shall not prescribe its own creed, in the instruction of the children of others. We construct and remodel partizan formulas and platforms with changing circumstances, with almost as much diligence and versatility as the Mexicans; and we attempt to enforce conformity to them, with scarcely less of zeal and intolerance, not indeed by the sword, but by the greater terror of political proscription. We resist argument, not always with argument, but often with personal denunciation, and sometimes even with combined violence. We differ, indeed, as to the particular errors of political faith, that

shall be corrected by this extreme remedy; but, nevertheless, the number of those who altogether deny its necessity and suitableness in some cases, is very small.

We justly maintain that a free press is the palladium of liberty; and yet, mutually proscribing all editorial independence that is manifested by opposition to our own opinions, we have only attained a press that is free in the sense that every interest, party, faction, or sect, can have its own independent organ. If it be still maintained, notwithstanding these illustrations to the contrary, that entire social independence prevails, then, I ask, why is it so necessary to preserve with jealousy, as we justly do, the ballot, in lieu of open suffrage; for if every citizen is really free from all fear and danger, why should he mask his vote more than his face. Believe me, fellow citizens, independence always languishes in the very degree that intolerance prevails. We smile at the vanity of the factory girl of Lowell, who, having spent the secular part of the week in making calicoes for the use of her unsophisticated countrywomen, disdainfully arrays herself on Sundays exclusively in the tints of European dyes; and yet, we are indifferent to the fact that besides a universal consumption of foreign silks, excluding the silkworm from our country, we purchase, in England alone, one hundred and fifty millions of yards of the same stained muslins. We sustain, here and there, a rickety, or at best a contracted iron manufactory; while we import iron to make railroads over our own endless ore fields, and we carry our prejudices against our struggling manufacturers and mechanics so far as to fastidiously avoid wearing on our persons, or using on our tables, or displaying in our drawing-rooms, any fabric, of whatsoever material, texture or color, that, in the course of its manufacture, has, to our best knowledge and belief, ever come in contact with the honest hand of an American citizen. In all this, we are less independent than the Englishman, the Frenchman, or even the Siberian.

It is painful to confess the same infirmity in regard to intellectual productions. We despise, deeply and universally, the spoiled child of pretension, who, going abroad for education or observation, with a mind destitute of the philosophy of travel, returns to us with an affected tone and gait, sure indications of a craven spirit and a disloyal heart. And yet how intently do we not watch to see whether one of our countrymen obtains in Europe the honor of an aristocratic dinner, or of a presentation, in a grotesque costume, at court!

How do we not suspend our judgment on the merits of the native artist, be he dancer, singer, actor, limner, or sculptor, and even of the native author, inventor, orator, bishop or statesman, until by flattering those who habitually depreciate his country, he passes safely the ordeal of foreign criticism, and so commends himself to our own most cautious approbation. How do we not consult foreign mirrors, for our very virtues and vices, not less than for our fashions, and think ignorance, bribery, and slavery, quite justified at home, if they can be matched against oppression, pauperism and crime in other countries!

On occasions too, we are bold in applauding heroic struggling for freedom abroad; and we certainly have hailed with enthusiasm every republican revolution in South America, in France, in Poland, in Germany and in Hungary. And yet how does not our sympathy rise and fall, with every change of the political temperature in Europe? In just this extent, we are not only not independent, but we are actually governed by the monarchies and aristocracies of the Old World.

You may ask impatiently, if I require the American citizen to throw off all submission to law, all deference to authority, and all respect to the opinions of mankind, and that the American Republic shall constantly wage an aggressive war against all foreign systems? I answer, no. There is here, as everywhere, a middle and a safe way. I would have the American citizen yield always a cheerful acquiescence, and never a servile adherence, to the opinions of the majority of his countrymen and of mankind, whether they be engrossed in the forms of law or not, on all questions involving no moral principle; and even in regard to such as do affect the conscience, I would have him avoid not only faction, but even the appearance of it. But I demand, at the same time, that he shall have his own matured and independent convictions, the result not of any authority, domestic or foreign, on every measure of public policy, and so, that while always temperate and courteous, he shall always be a free and outspeaking censor, upon not only opinions, customs and administration, but even upon laws and constitutions themselves. What I thus require of the citizen, I insist, also, that he shall allow to every one of his fellow-citizens. I would have the nation also, though moderate and pacific, yet always frank, decided and firm, in bearing its testimony against error and oppression; and while ab-

staining from forcible intervention in foreign disputes, yet always fearlessly rendering to the cause of republicanism everywhere, by influence and example, all the aid that the laws of nations do not peremptorily, or, in their true spirit, forbid.

Do I propose in this a heretical, or even a new standard of public or private duty? All agree that the customary, and even the legal standards in other countries are too low. Must we then abide by them now and forever? That would be to yield our independence, and to be false towards mankind. Who will maintain that the standard established at any one time by a majority in our country is infallible, and therefore final? If it be so, why have we reserved, by our constitution, freedom of speech, of the press, and of suffrage, to reverse it? No, we may change everything, first complying, however, with constitutional conditions. Storms and commotions must indeed be avoided, but the political waters must nevertheless be agitated always, or they will stagnate. Let no one suppose that the human mind will consent to rest in error. It vibrates, however, only that it may settle at last in immutable truth and justice. Nor need we fear that we shall be too bold. Conformity is always easier than contention; and imitation is always easier than innovation. There are many who delight in ease, where there is one who chooses, and fearlessly pursues, the path of heroic duty.

Moreover, while we are expecting hopefully to see foreign customs and institutions brought, by the influence of commerce, into conformity with our own, it is quite manifest that commerce has reciprocating influences, tending to demoralize ourselves, and so to assimilate our opinions, manners and customs, ultimately to those of aristocracy and despotism. We cannot afford to err at all on that side. We exist as a free people only by force of our very peculiarities. They are the legitimate peculiarities of republicanism, and, as such, are the test of nationality.

Nationality! It is as just as it is popular. Whatever policy, interest or institution is local, sectional, or foreign, must be zealously watched and counteracted; for it tends directly to social derangement, and so to the subversion of our democratic constitution.

But it is seen at once that this nationality is identical with that very political independence which results from a high tone of individuality on the part of the citizen. Let it have free play, then, and so let every citizen value himself at his just worth, in body and soul;

namely, not as a serf or a subject of any human authority, or the inferior of any class, however great or wise, but as a freeman, who is so because "Truth has made him free;" who not only, equally with all others, rules in the republic, but is also bound, equally with any other, to exercise designing wisdom and executive vigor and efficiency in the eternal duty of saving and perfecting the state. When this nationality shall prevail, we shall no more see fashion, wealth, social rank, political combination, or even official proscription, effective in suppressing the utterance of mature opinions and true convictions; and so enforcing for brief periods, with long reactions, political conformity, at the hazard of the public welfare, and at the cost of the public virtue.

Let this nationality prevail, and then, instead of keenly watching, not without sinister wishes, for war or famine, the fitful skies, or the evermore capricious diplomacy of Europe; and instead of being hurried into unwise commercial expansion by the rise of credit there, and then back again into exhausting convulsions and bankruptcy by its fall, we shall have a steady and a prosperous, because it will be an independent, internal commerce.

Let this nationality prevail, and then we shall cease to undervalue our own farmers, mechanics, and manufacturers, and their productions; our own science, and literature, and inventions; our own orators and statesmen; in short, our own infinite resources and all-competent skill, our own virtue, and our own peculiar and justly envied freedom.

Then, I am sure that, instead of perpetually levying large and exhausting armies, like Russia, and without wasting wealth in emulating the naval power of England, and without practising a servile conformity to the diplomacy of courts, and without captiously seeking frivolous occasions for making the world sensible of our importance, we shall, by the force of our own genius and virtue, and the dignity of freedom, take, with the free consent of mankind, the first place in the great family of nations.

Gentlemen of the Institute: From the earnestness with which the theory of free trade is perpetually urged in some quarters, one might suppose that it was thought that the cardinal interest of the country lay in mere exchanging of merchandise. On the contrary, of the three great wheels of national prosperity, agriculture is the main one, manufacture second, and trade is the last. The cardinal interest of

this and every country is, and always must be, production. It is not traffic, but labor alone, that converts the resources of the country into wealth. The world has yet to see any state become great by mere trade. It has seen many become so by the exercise of industry.

Where there are diversified resources, and industry is applied to only a few staples, three great interest are neglected, viz.: natural resources, which are left unimproved; labor, that is left unemployed; and internal exchanges, which a diversity of industry would render necessary. The foreign commerce, which is based on such a narrow system of production, obliges the nation to sell its staples at prices reduced by competition in foreign markets; and to buy fabrics at prices established by monopoly in the same markets.

This false economy crowds the culture of the few staples with excessive industry; thus rendering labor dependent at home, while it brings the whole nation tributary to the monopolizing manufacturer abroad. When all, or any of the nations of Europe shall, as well as ourselves, be found successfully competing with England in manufactures, then, and not till then, will the free trade she recommends, be as wise for others, as she now insists. But, when that time shall come, I venture to predict that England will cease to inculcate that dogma.

The importance of maintaining such a policy as will result in a diversified application of industry, seems to rest on these impregnable grounds, viz.: 1st. That the use of indigenous materials does not diminish, but on the contrary, increases the public wealth. 2d. That society is constituted so, that individuals voluntarily classify themselves in all, and not in a few, departments of industry, by reason of a distributive congeniality of tastes and adaptation of powers; and that while labor so distributed is more profitable, the general contentment and independence of the people is secured and preserved, and their enterprise is stimulated and sustained.

I think it must be confessed now, by all candid observers within our country, that manufactures have become in a degree the exclusive employment of the citizens of the Eastern States; and yet they are precarious, and comparatively unprofitable, because our own patronage, so generously discriminating in favor of European manufactures, enables them to make the desired fabrics sometimes at less cost: that the citizens of the Middle and Western States, are confined chiefly to the raising of staple breadstuffs, for which, while

they have a great excess above the home consumption, resulting from the neglect of domestic manufactures, they find a market almost overstocked with similar productions, raised in countries as peculiarly agricultural as our own; and that the citizens of the Southern States restrict themselves chiefly to the culture of cotton, of which, practically, they have the monopoly; that the annual enlargement of the cotton culture tends to depress its price, and that they pay more dearly for the fabrics which they use, than would be necessary if our own manufactures could better maintain a competition with those of Europe.

These inconveniences would indeed become intolerable evils, if they were not compensated in some measure by the great increase of wealth resulting from the immigration of foreign labor; and by the establishment of a new and prosperous gold trade between the Atlantic States and California.

Why should these inconveniences be endured? Certainly not because we do not know that they are unnecessary. We jealously guard our culture of breadstuffs and sugar against the competition of the foreign farmer and planter in our own markets. Practically, our gold mining is equally protected. We also give an exclusive preference in our internal commerce to our own shipping. No one questions the advantages derived from these great departments of production. But it is not easy to see how the equally successful opening of other domestic resources should not be equally beneficial.

Why should it be less profitable to supply ourselves with copper, iron, glass and paper from our own resources, and by our own industry, than it is to supply ourselves in the same way with flour, sugar and gold? Why should it not be as economical to manufacture our own cotton, wool, iron and gold, as it is to manufacture our own furniture, wooden clocks and ships? If mining and manufactures generally were not profitable in England, they would not be prosecuted there. If they are profitable there, they would be profitable here. You reply that manufacturing labor is cheaper there. Yes, because you leave it there. If you offer inducements, it will come here just as freely as agricultural labor now comes. The ocean is reduced to a ferry. If you must depend on foreign skill for fabrics, I pray you bring that skill here, where you can sustain it with greater economy.

The advocates of dependence on foreign manufactures tell us that it is as well to sell gold and buy iron, as it would be to sell iron to buy gold. I reply, 1st. That, to the extent of our necessary consumption, having exhaustless resources and adequate industry or ability to procure both, we ought to buy neither. 2d. When Boulton, the associate of the great Watt, showed his iron manufactory, he said, "I sell here what all men are anxious to buy, Power." It has been proved that a nation may sell gold for iron without gaining power, as many a nation has bought iron without securing it. But it is clear, that the nation that makes its own iron creates its own power.

It seems to be understood by the advocates of foreign manufactures here, that only those branches languish which have not sufficient vigor to be brought to maturity, by never so much protection. This is opposed to the experience of all mankind. There is not, in France or in England, a successful culture or manufacture that has not been made so by the application of national protection and patronage. The manufacturers of England are sustained, even now, by the sacrifice of agricultural labor there. The decline of agriculture is proved by a rapidly increasing emigration from the British islands. What England calls free trade is, indeed, a new form of protection, but it is protection, nevertheless. She finds it equally effective and expensive. British commerce and British manufactures do indeed flourish, but British empire declines. The decline is seen in the tameness of England, now, toward Russia, France, and our own country, compared with the different attitude she maintained against all offending powers in the age of the elder Pitt and the younger Pitt.

It is insisted, however, that encouragement yielded to the industry of one class of citizens is partial and injurious to that of others. This cannot be in any just sense true, since the prosperity and vigor of each class depend in a great degree on the prosperity and vigor of all the industrial classes. But all experience shows, that if government do not favor domestic enterprise, its negative policy will benefit some foreign monopoly, which, of all class legislation, is most injurious and least excusable.

Once more, it is said that the present system must be right, because predictions of disasters that should result from it have been falsified. I do not dwell on the signs which seem now to portend a fearful fulfillment, nevertheless, of those predictions. Let it suffice to say,

that it is as common an error to look prematurely for the blights which must follow erroneous culture, as it is to expect propitious fruits from that which is judicious. This nation is youthful and vigorous. It cannot now suffer long and deeply from any cause, for it has great recuperative energies. It is not destined to an immediate fall, or even to early decline. It is the part of wisdom, nevertheless, not to try how much of erroneous administration it can bear, but to adapt our policy always so as to favor the most complete and lasting success of the republic.

Gentlemen of the Institute: I refrain from discussing the details of a protective policy. Circumstances are hastening a necessity for an examination of them, in another place, where action follows debate, and is effective. I shall not be absent nor idle there. But I will not attempt to delude either myself or you into the belief that the opinions I have expressed, which, I trust, in some degree correspond with your own, will soon become fully engrafted into the policy of the government. I shall perform my duty better by showing you that it is not wise to expect, nor even absolutely necessary to depend on, the exercise of a just patronage of our industry by the government.

This republic, although constituting one nation, partakes of the form of a confederation of many states, and, for the purpose of securing acquiescence, allows great power to minorities. Although there is no real antagonism of interests, there is, nevertheless, a wide divergence of opinion concerning those interests, resulting from the different degrees of maturity and development reached in the several states. Massachusetts and Virginia, New York and South Carolina, scarcely differ in their ages; but, nevertheless, they differ in their industrial systems as widely as Pennsylvania and Arkansas. The old free states have passed through the stages at which the merely agricultural and planting states have only arrived. It would practically be as impossible to bring these latter states immediately up to our proper policy, as it would be to carry us backward to the system which they are pursuing. They will resist all such efforts, earnestly and perseveringly, so long as they shall feel that they are unable, like us, to distribute their industry, and so to share in the benefits of that policy. All that we can expect, under such circumstances, from the government, is some occasional and partial modification of its financial policy, so as to favor the success of the efforts

of the friends of home industry in establishing it on a safe basis, without the immediate and direct aid of congress. And this will be sufficient. It is not yet forty years since New York applied in vain to the United States to construct the Erie canal, which was acknowledged to be the incipient measure in a system of internal improvements to be coëxtensive with the republic. Now, not only that canal has been built, but the whole system is in a train of accomplishment, although congress has not only never adopted, but has almost constantly repudiated it. Private and corporate enterprise, sustained by the states, has worked out what the federal government has refused to undertake. The same agencies will establish the American system. Capital, labor, science, skill, are augmenting here. Power is daily becoming cheaper, and consumption more extensive. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Ohio, have become manufacturing states. The advantages resulting from the policy are indicated, not more by the universal improvement of the agricultural districts in these states, than by the prosperity and growth of their towns and cities. Here are Boston, Lowell, Lawrence, Springfield, Providence, New Haven, Rutland, Bennington, New York, Albany, Troy, Rochester and Buffalo, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Newark and Paterson, Wilmington and Baltimore, Cincinnati and Cleveland; contrast with them the towns and cities of those states which practically adhere to the policy of employing foreign industry, and you see plainly the results of that error. This contrast excites inquiry, and inquiry will go on, until it shall correct the great mistake, and introduce universal emulation.

Persevere, then, Gentlemen of the Institute; for, while you are represented as hindering the prosperity of the country, you, and none so much as you, are securing it, and rendering it universal. While you are regarded as favoring privileges and monopolies, you, and none so much as you, are counteracting pauperism and class legislation. While you are censured for opposing the interests of commerce, you, and none so much as you, are laying sure foundations for a commerce that shall be broad as the limits of the earth, and lasting as the necessities and the enterprise of mankind. While you are represented as checking the rising greatness of the nation, you, and only you, by lifting labor to its rightful rank, are elevating the republic to true and lasting independence.

THE PHYSICAL, MORAL, AND INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.[1]

A POLITICAL discourse may seem out of time and out of place at a classic festival and in academic groves. Nevertheless, the office of instructor to a prince brought something more of dignity even to the learning and piety of Fenelon. To study the forces and tendency of a republic which is not obscure, cannot, therefore, at any time or in any place, be unbecoming an association which regards universal philosophy as the proper guide of human life.

Nations are intelligent, moral persons, existing for the ends of their own happiness and the improvement of mankind. They grow, mature, and decline. Their physical development, being most obvious, always attracts our attention first. Certainly we cannot too well understand the material condition of our own country. "I think," said Burke, sadly, addressing the British house of commons, just after the American war, "I think I can trace all the calamities of this country to the single source of not having had steadily before our eyes a general, comprehensive, well connected, and well proportioned view of the whole of our dominions, and a just sense of their bearings and relations."

Trace on a map the early boundaries of the United States, as they were defined by the treaty of Versailles, in 1783. See with what jealousy Great Britain abridged their enjoyment of the fisheries on the northeast coast, and how tenaciously she locked up against them the St. Lawrence, the only possible channel between their inland regions and the Atlantic ocean. Observe how Spain, while retaining the vast and varied solitudes which spread out westward from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean, at the same time assigned the thirty-first parallel of north latitude as the southern boundary of the United States, and thus shut them out from access by that river or otherwise to the gulf of Mexico. See now how the massive and

[1] An Address before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Yale College: New Haven, July 26, 1854.

unpassable Alleghany mountains traversed the new republic from north to south, dividing it into two regions—the inner one rich in agricultural resources, but without markets; and the outer one adapted to defense and markets, but wanting the materials for commerce. Were not the Europeans astute in thus confining the United States within limits which would probably render an early separation of them inevitable, and would also prevent equally the whole and each of the future parts from ever becoming a formidable or even a really independent Atlantic power? They had cause for their jealousies. They were monarchies, and they largely divided the western hemisphere between them. The United States aimed to become a maritime nation, and their success would tend to make that hemisphere not only republican, but also independent of Europe. That success was foreseen. A British statesman, in describing the American colonies just before the peace, had said to his countrymen: "Your children do not grow faster from infancy to manhood than they spread from families to communities, and from villages to nations."

The United States, thus confined landward, betook themselves to the sea, whose broad realm lay unappropriated; and, having furnished themselves with shipping and seamen equal to the adventurous pursuit of the whale fishery under the poles, they presented themselves in European ports as a maritime people. Afterwards, their well-known attitude of neutrality, in a season of general war, enabled them to become carriers for the world. But they never forgot, for a moment, the importance of improving their position on the coast. France was now the owner of the province of Louisiana, which stretched all along the western bank of the Mississippi. She wisely sold a possession, which she was unable to defend, to the United States, who thus, only twenty years after the treaty of Versailles, secured the exclusive navigation of the great river; and, descending from their inland frontier, established themselves on the coast of the gulf of Mexico. Spain soon saw that her colonies on that coast, east of the Mississippi, now virtually surrounded by the United States, were thenceforward untenable. She, therefore, for an equivalent, ceded the Floridas, and retired behind the Sabine; and so the seacoast of the United States was now seen to begin at that river, and, passing along the gulf and around the Pensacola, and beyond the capes, to terminate at the St. Croix, in the bay of Fundy.

The course of the European war showed that Spain was exhausted. Nearly all her American colonies, inspired by the example of the United States, and sustained by their sympathy, struck for independence, established republican systems, and entered into treaties of amity and commerce with the republic of the north.

But the United States yet needed a northern passage from their western valleys to the Atlantic ocean. The new channel to be opened must necessarily have connections, natural or artificial, with the inland rivers and lakes. An internal trade, ramifying the country, was a necessary basis for commerce, and it would constitute the firmest possible national union. Practically, there was, in the country, neither a canal to serve for a model nor an engineer competent to project one. The railroad invention had not yet been perfected in Europe, nor even conceived in the United States. The federal government alone had adequate resources, but, after long consideration and some unprofitable experiments, it not only disavowed the policy, but also disclaimed the power of making internal improvements. Private capital was unavailable for great national enterprises. The states were not convinced of the wisdom of undertaking, singly, works within their own borders which would be wholly or in part useless, unless extended beyond them by other states, and which, even although they should be useful to themselves, would be equally or more beneficial to states which refused or neglected to join in their construction. Moreover, the only source of revenue in the states was direct taxation—always unreliable in a popular government—and they had no established credits at home or abroad. Nevertheless, the people comprehended the exigency, and their will opened a way through all these embarrassments. The state of New York began, and she has hitherto, although sometimes faltering, prosecuted this great enterprise with unsurpassed fidelity. The other states, according to their respective abilities and convictions of interest and duty, have coöperated. By canals we have extended the navigation of Chesapeake bay to the coal fields of Maryland at Cumberland, and also, by the way of Columbia, to the coal fields of Pennsylvania. By canals we have united Chesapeake bay with the Delaware river, and have, with alternating railroads, connected that river with the Ohio river and with lake Erie. By canals we have opened a navigation between Philadelphia and New York, mingling the waters of the Delaware with those of the Raritan. By canals we have given

access from two several ports on the Hudson to two different coal fields in Pennsylvania. By canals we have also extended the navigation of the Hudson, through lake Champlain and its outlet, to the St. Lawrence near Montreal. We are just opening a channel from the Hudson to Cape Vincent, on lake Ontario, near its eastern termination, while we long since have opened one from the same river to a central harbor on that lake at Oswego. A corresponding improvement, made by the Canadian authorities on the opposite shore, prolongs our navigation from lake Ontario to lake Erie. We have also connected the Hudson river with the eastern branch of the Susquehanna, through the valley of the Chenango, and again with its western tributaries through the Seneca lake. We are also uniting the Hudson with the Alleghany, a tributary of the Mississippi, through the valley of the Genesee. One long trunk of canal receives the trade gathered by most of these tributary channels, while it directly unites the Hudson with lake Erie at Buffalo. The shores of that great lake are the basis of a second part of the same system. Canals connect the Alleghany, in the state of Pennsylvania, with lake Erie, at Erie; the Ohio river, at Portage and at Cincinnati; with lake Erie, at Cleveland and Toledo; and again the Ohio river, in the state of Indiana, with lake Erie, through the valley of the Wabash. Lake Superior, hitherto secluded from even internal commerce, is now being connected with the other great lakes by the canal of the falls of St. Marie; and; to complete the whole, the Illinois canal unites the lakes and all the extensive system I have described with the Mississippi. Thus, by substituting works purely artificial, we have not only dispensed with the navigation of the St. Lawrence, but have also opened a complete circuit of inland navigation and traffic between New Orleans, on the gulf, and New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, on the Atlantic. The aggregate length of those canals is five thousand miles, and that of the inland coasts thus washed by natural and artificial channels exceeds twenty thousand miles.

Railroads constitute an auxiliary system of improvements, at once more complex and more comprehensive. By railroads we have connected, or are in the act of connecting together, all the principal seaports on the Atlantic coast and on the coasts of the gulf of Mexico, namely, Portland, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Charleston, Mobile, and New Orleans. Again—railroads from

each or most of these ports proceed inland through important towns, to great dépôts on the St. Lawrence, the lakes, the Ohio, and the Mississippi, namely, Quebec, Montreal, Ogdensburgh, Oswego, Rochester, Buffalo, Erie, Cleveland, Sandusky, Toledo, Monroe, Detroit, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Cairo, and Memphis. Again—there are tributaries which search out agricultural and mineral productions and fabrics, accumulated at less notable points; and so a complete system is perfected, which leaves no inhabited region unexplored, while it has for its base the long line of seaboard. The aggregate length of these railroads is sixteen thousand miles, and the total cost is six hundred millions of dollars.

Immediately after the purchase of Louisiana, President Jefferson having conceived the idea of a national establishment on the Pacific coast, an exploration of the intervening wastes was made. An American navigator, about the same time, visited the coast itself, and thus laid the foundation of a title by discovery. A commercial settlement, afterwards planted on the Columbia river by the late John Jacob Astor, perished in the war of 1812. Ten years ago, the great thought of Pacific colonization revived, under the influence of the commercial activity resulting from the successful progress of the system of internal improvements. Oregon was settled. Two years afterward, its boundaries were defined, and it was politically organized; and now it constitutes two prosperous territories.

The social, military, and ecclesiastical institutions of Mexico proved unfavorable to an immediate success of the republican system. Revolution became a chronic disease there. Texas separated, and practically became independent, although Mexico refused to recognize her separation. After some years, Texas was admitted as a state into our Federal Union. A war which ensued resulted, not only in the relinquishment of Mexican claims upon Texas, but in the extension of her coast frontier to the Rio Grande, and also in the annexation of New Mexico and Upper California to the United States.

Thus, in sixty-five years after the peace of Versailles, the United States advanced from the Mississippi, and occupied a line stretching through eighteen degrees of latitude on the Pacific coast, overlooking the Sandwich islands and Japan, and confronting China (the Cathay for which Columbus was in search when he encountered the bewildering vision of San Domingo). The new possession was divided into two territories and the state of California. The simultane-

ous discovery of native gold in the sands and rocks of that State resulted in the instantaneous establishment of an active commerce, not only with our Atlantic cities, but also with the ports of South America and with the maritime countries of Europe, with the Sandwich Islands, and even with China. Thus the United States ceased to be a mere Atlantic nation, and assumed the attitude of a great continental power, enjoying ocean navigation on either side, and bearing equal and similar relations to the eastern and to the western coast of the old world. The national connections between the Atlantic and Pacific regions are yet incomplete; but the same spirit which has brought them into political union is at work still, and no matter what the government may do or may leave undone, the necessary routes of commerce, altogether within and across our own domain, will be yet established.

The number of states has increased, since this aggrandizement began, from seventeen to thirty-one; the population from five millions to twenty-four millions; the tonnage employed in commerce from one million to four and a half millions; and the national revenues from ten millions to sixty millions of dollars. Within that period, Spain has retired altogether from the continent, and two considerable islands in the Antilles are all that remains of the New World which, hardly four centuries ago, the generous and pious Genoese navigator, under the patronage of Isabella, gave to the kingdoms of Castile and Leon. Great Britain tenders us now the freedom of the fisheries and of the St. Lawrence, on conditions of favor to the commerce of her colonies, and even deliberates on the policy of releasing them from their allegiance. The influences of the United States on the American continent have resulted already in the establishment of the republican system everywhere, except in Brazil, and even there in limiting imperial power. In Europe they have awakened a war of opinion, that, after spreading desolation into the steppes of Russia, and to the base of the Carpathian mountains, has only been suppressed for a time by combination of the capital and of the political forces of that continent. In Africa, those influences, aided by the benevolent efforts of our citizens, have produced the establishment of a republic, which, beginning with the abolition of the traffic in slaves, is going steadily on toward the moral regeneration of its savage races. In the Sandwich Islands, those influences have already effected, not only such a regeneration of the natives,

but also a political organization, which is bringing that important commercial station directly under our protection. Those influences have opened the ports of Japan, and secured an intercourse of commerce and friendship with its extraordinary people—numbering forty millions—thus overcoming a policy of isolation which they had practised for a hundred and fifty years. The same influences have not only procured for us access to the five principal ports of China, but also have generated a revolution there, which promises to bring the three hundred millions living within that vast empire into the society of the western nations.

How magnificent is the scene which the rising curtain discloses to us here! and how sublime the pacific part assigned to us!

> "The eastern nations sink, their glory ends,
> And empire rises where the sun descends."

But, restraining the imagination from its desire to follow the influences of the United States in their future progress through the Manillas, and along the Indian coast, and beyond the Persian gulf, to the far-off Mozambique, let us dwell for a moment on the visible results of the national aggrandizement at home. Wealth has everywhere increased, and has been equalized with much success in all the states, new as well as old. Industry has persevered in opening newly discovered resources, and bringing forth their treasures, as well as in the establishment of the productive arts. The capitol, which at first seemed too pretentious, is extending itself northward and southward upon its noble terrace, to receive the representatives of new incoming states. The departments of executive administration continually expand under their lofty arches and behind their lengthening colonnades. The federal city, so recently ridiculed for its ambitious solitudes, is extending its broad avenues in all directions, and, under the hands of native artists, is taking on the graces, as well as the fullness, of a capital. Where else will you find authority so august as in a council composed of the representatives of thirty states, attended by ambassadors from every free city, every republic, and every court, in the civilized world? In near proximity, and in intimate connection with that capital, a metropolis has arisen, which gathers, by the agency of canals, of railroads, and of coastwise navigation, the products of industry in every form throughout the North American states, as well those under foreign jurisdiction as those which consti-

tute the Union, and distributes them in exchange over the globe—a city whose wealth and credit supply or procure the capital employed in all the great financial movements within the republic, and whose press, in all its departments of science, literature, religion, philanthropy, and politics, is a national one. Thus, expansion and aggrandizement, whose natural tendency is to produce debility and dissolution, have operated here to create, what before was wanting, a social, political, and commercial centre.

In considering the causes of this material growth, allowance must be made, liberally made, for great advantages of space, climate, and resources, as well as for the weakness of outward resistance, for the vices of foreign governments, and for the disturbed and painful condition of society under them—causes which have created and sustained a tide of emigration towards the United States unparalleled, at least in modern times. But when all this allowance shall have been made, we shall still find that the phenomenon is chiefly due to the operation here of some great ideas, either unknown before, or not before rendered so effective. These ideas are, first, the equality of men in a state, that is to say, the equality of men constituting a state; secondly, the equality of states in a combination, or, in other words, the equality of states constituting a nation. By the constitution of every state in the American Union, each citizen is guaranteed his natural rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and he, at the same time, is guaranteed a share of the sovereign power, equal to that which can be assumed by any other citizen. This is the equality of men in the state. By the constitution of the United States, there are no subjects. Every citizen of any one state is a free and equal citizen of the United States. Again, by the constitution of the United States, there are no permanent provinces, or dependencies. The Union is constituted by states, and all of them stand upon the same level of political rights. This is the equality of states in the nation.

The reduction of the two abstractions which I have mentioned into the concrete, in the constitution of the United States, was, like most other inventions, mainly due to accident. There were thirteen several states, in each of which, owing to fortunate circumstances attending their original colonization, each citizen was not only free, but also practically equal, in his exercise of political power, to every other citizen of that state. The freedom and equality of the citizen,

and the inalienability of his natural rights, were solemnly reaffirmed in the Declaration of Independence. These thirteen states were severally free and independent of each other. They, therefore, were equal states. Each was a sovereign. They needed free and mutual commerce among themselves, and some regulations for securing to each equal facilities of commerce with foreign countries. A union was necessary to the attainment of these ends. But the citizens of each state were unwilling to surrender either their natural and inalienable rights, *or the guardianship* of them, to a common government over them all, even to attain the union which they needed so much. So a federal central government was established, which is sovereign only in commerce at home and abroad, and in the necessary communications with other nations; that is to say, sovereign only in regard to the mutual internal relations of the states themselves, and in regard to foreign affairs. In this government the states are practically equal constituents, although the equality was modified by some limitations found necessary to secure the assent of some of the states. The states were not dissolved, nor disorganized, but they remain really states, just as before, existing independently of each other and of the Union, and exercising sovereignty in all the municipal departments of society. The citizen of each state also retains all his natural rights equally in the Union and in the state to which he belongs, and the United States are constituted by the whole mass of such citizens throughout all the several states. There was an unoccupied common domain, which the several states surrendered to the federal authorities, to the end that it might be settled, colonized, and divided into other states, to be organized and to become members of the Union on an equal footing with the original states. When additions to this domain were made from foreign countries, the same principles seemed to be the only ones upon which the government could be extended over them, and so, with some qualifications unimportant on the present occasion, they became universal in their application.

No other nation, pursuing a career of aggrandizement, has adopted the great ideas thus developed in the United States. The Macedonian conquered kingdoms for the mere gratification of conquest, and they threw off the sway he established over them as soon as the sword dropped from his hand. The Romans conquered, because the alien was a barbarian rival and enemy, and because Rome must fill the world alone. The empire, thus extended, fell under the blows

of enemies, subjugated but not subdued, as soon as the central power had lost its vigor. The Ottoman, although he conquered with the sword, conciliated the subjected tribes by admitting them to the rites of a new and attractive religion. The religion, however, was of this world, and sensual, and therefore it debased its votaries. France attempted to conquer Europe in retaliation for wrongs committed against herself; but the bow broke in her hands, just as it was bent to discharge the last shaft. Spain has planted many colonies and conquered many states, but the Castilian was proud and haughty; he enslaved the native and oppressed the creole. The Czar wins his way amid kindred races, as a parent extending protection in the enjoyment of a common religion. But the paternal relation in politics is a fiction of despotism, which extinguishes all individual energy and all social ambition. Great Britain has been distinguished from all these vulgar conquerors. She is a civilizer and a missionary. She has planted many colonies in the west, and conquered many and vast countries in the east, and has carried English laws and the English language around the world. But Great Britain at home is an aristocracy. Her colonies can neither be equal to her, nor yet independent. Her subjects in those countries may be free, but they cannot be Britons. Consequently, her dependencies are always discontented, and insomuch as they are possessed or swayed by freemen, they are only retained in their connection with the British throne by the presence of military and naval force. You identify an American state or colony by the absence of the federal power. Everywhere, on the contrary, you identify a British colony, whether in British America, or on the Pacific coast, or on its islands, or in Bombay, or at Saint Helena, or at Gibraltar, or on the Ionian isles, by the music of the imperial drum-beat and the frown of royal battlements. Great Britain always inspires fear, and often commands respect, but she has no friends in the wide family of nations. So it has happened, that heretofore nations have either repelled, or exhausted, or disgusted the colonies they planted and the countries they conquered.

The United States, on the contrary, expand, not by force of arms, but by attraction. The native colonist no sooner reaches a new and distant home, whether in a cleft of the Rocky mountains or on the seashore, than he proceeds to found a state, in which his natural and inalienable rights shall be secure, and which shall become an equal

member of the federal union, enjoying its protection, and sharing its growing greatness and renown. Adjacent states, though of foreign habits, religion and descent, especially if they are defenceless, look with favor upon the approach of a power that will leave them in full enjoyment of the rights of nature, and at the same time that it may absorb them, will spare their corporate existence and individuality. The attraction increases as commerce widens the circle of the national influence.

If these positions seem to require qualification at all, the very modifications will, nevertheless, serve to illustrate and sustain the general principles involved. The people of Mexico resist annexation because they fear it would result in their being outnumbered by Americans, and so lead to the restoration of African slavery, which they have abolished. The natives of the Sandwich Islands take alarm lest by annexation they may themselves be reduced to slavery The people of the Canadas hesitate because they disapprove the modification of the principles of equality of men and of states in favor of slaveholding states, which were admitted in the federal constitution.

What is the moral to be drawn from the physical progress of the United States? It is, that the strongest bonds of cohesion in society are commerce and gratitude for protected freedom.

While the majestic physical progress of the United States is no longer denied as a fact, it is, nevertheless, too generally regarded as purely accidental, and likely to cease through a want of corresponding intelligence and virtue. The principle assumed in this reasoning is just. A nation deficient in intelligence and virtue is an ignoble one, and no ignoble race can enlarge or even retain empire. But examination will show that the facts assumed are altogether erroneous. In order to prove that we are deficient in intelligence, the monuments of ancient and modern nations, all of whom have either completed their courses or passed the middle point, are arrayed before us, and we are challenged to exhibit similar monuments of equal merit on the part of the United States; as if time were not an essential condition of achievement, and as if, also, circumstances exert no influence in directing the activity of nations. It is true that we can show no campaigns equal to those of Cæsar, or of Frederick, or of Napoleon; and no inspirations of the divine art equal to the Iliad, or the Eneid, or the Inferno, or the dramas of Shakspeare. But it

is equally true that neither Greece, nor Rome, nor France, nor England, has erected a tower as high as Babel, or a mausoleum so massive as the grand pyramid.

Reasoning *à priori*, it is manifest, that insomuch as the physical progress of the United States has been unprecedented while it has followed a method, and insomuch as this progress has been conducted with magnanimity through many temptations and embarrassments, it is of itself no unworthy monument of national intelligence.

The constitutions (of the states and of the Union) are confessedly unsurpassed. Grant, as is true, that all the great political ideas which are embodied in them, were before known; grant, moreover, that a favorable conjuncture for reducing those abstractions to the concrete had come; grant, also, that favorable conditions of nature and human society concurred: nevertheless, even then I may ask, was ever higher genius, or greater talent, displayed, in conducting the affairs of men, than were exercised first in framing the many peculiar and delicate parts of that system of government, with proportions so accurate that each might bear the very tension and pressure to which it was to be exposed, and then in bringing all those parts together, and forging them into one great machine with such wonderful skill, that at the very first touch of the propelling popular spring, it went at once into full and perfect operation, and has continued its movements for seventy years, in prosperity as well as in adversity, amid the factions generated by a long peace, and the disturbances of war, not only without interruption or irregularity, but even without a jar. Consider the sagacity of the people that, amid the clouds of jealousy and the storms of passion, raised by heated partisans, deliberately examined, and resolutely adopted, that wonderful yet untried mechanism, so well contrived for their use, and decided that it should not merely have a trial, but should stand forever, the only government of themselves and of their posterity. Consider, that not only was this vast engine set in motion by the voluntary act of the people, but it has also been kept in motion by their own perpetually renewed consent and direct activity; and that, although like every other combination of forces, it has its dead points, yet it passes through them with perfect regularity, and without even any sensible diminution of motion, owing to the watchful performance by the people at critical moments, of the functions devolved upon them. Consider how many and various are the human wills,

which meet and concur, every time a fresh impulse is given to the great mechanism. A majority of the states, neglecting or refusing to act on any such occasion, could bring the government to a dead stand. Consider that the people not only interfere on such critical occasions, but also that they are continually supplying the necessary force to sustain the movements of the subordinate parts of the machine.

There are two and a half millions of electors, and every one of these is charged with the performance, for the most part annually, of four classes of functions, in as many distinct spheres. Once, generally in each year, the electors choose a mayor or supervisor, aldermen or trustees, or selectmen, justices of the peace, police officers, clerks, assessors of taxes, commissioners of public charities, commissioners of streets, roads and bridges, and subalterns, or other officers of the militia, in their respective cities, towns, or other forms of municipalities. Again, the electors, generally once in each year, choose officers nearly as numerous, and of a higher grade, to execute judicial, ministerial, and fiscal powers of a similar nature, within the counties, which embrace several cities, towns and municipalities. Again, they elect governors, lieutenant-governors, senators and representatives, judges, treasurers and ministers of finance, of education, of public works and of charities, in the states constituted by such counties, states sovereign in all things, except the few departments they have voluntarily assigned to the Federal Union. Once more, the citizens choose, once in two years, representatives, and once in three years, senators, who exercise the legislative powers of the republic; and once in four years, the vice-president and president of the United States, its chief executive magistrates. The peace, order, prosperity, and happiness, and even the safety of society, rest manifestly on the soundness of judgment with which these many and various electoral trusts are discharged. Reflect, now, for a moment, on the perturbations of society, the devices and combinations of parties, and the appliances of corruption, to which the electoral body is at all times exposed. Could these functions be performed with results so generally auspicious if the people of the United States did not, as a mass, excel other nations in intelligence, as much as in the good fortune of inheriting such extraordinary institutions?

Look at the operation of this system in yet another aspect. Not only the constitutions of the several states, but even the constitution

of the Union, stands only by the voluntary consent of the people. By physical force, which the government could not suppress, they could subvert any or all of these constitutions. Even without force, and acting only by agreement, but in conformity to certain established conditions, they can change or subvert all these constitutions. There is indeed no restraining power acting upon them, from within or from without. Practically, they do change the constitutions of the several states once in twenty years. Yet they work such changes generally without commotion, and they have never made one without replacing the constitution removed by a better one. A few of the states inherited the jurisprudence of the civil law, and all the others the common and statute laws of England. Does any one deny that they have sagaciously retained all the parts of those excellent codes which are essential to order and civil liberty, and have modified others only so far as was required by the changing circumstances of society and the ever-unfolding sentiments of justice and humanity? Let our logical amendments of the rules of evidence, and our simple processes of pleading and practice in courts of justice and our meliorations of imprisonment for debt, and of eleemosynary laws, and of penitentiary systems, vindicate the intellectual vigor and wisdom of the American people.

Modern invention, until the close of the last century, was chiefly employed in discovering new laws of nature, and in shaping those discoveries into the forms of theories and maxims. Thus far, in the present century, invention has employed itself in applying those theories and maxims, by various devices of mechanism, or otherwise, to practical use. In Europe, those devices are chiefly such as regard æsthetic effect. In America, on the other hand, those devices are such as have for their object the increase of power. Required to subdue nature through a broad range quickly, and to bring forth her various resources with haste, and yet having numbers inadequate and capital quite unequal to such labors, the American studies chiefly economy and efficiency. He has examined every instrument, and engine, and combination, and composition, received from his elder trans-atlantic brother, in the light of those objects, and has either improved it, or devised a new and better one. He aims at doing the most that is possible as quickly as possible; and this characteristic is manifested equally in his weapons of war and in his instruments of peace, whether they are to be used in the field, or in the work-

shop, on the land, or on the sea, the fire-arm, the ax, the plow, the railroad, the clipper-ship, the steam-engine and the printing-press. His railroads cost less and are less perfect than those in other countries, but he builds ten miles where they build only three. He moves passengers and freights on such roads and in his ships with less safety, but with greater cheapness and velocity. He prepares his newspapers, his magazines, and his treatises, with less care, but he prints a hundred for one. If the European has failed to give him necessary principle, or to embody it in a practical machine, he finds out the one, or constructs the other promptly for himself. He wanted machines for working up his forests, and he invented the saw-gang, and the grooving and planing machines; for cleaning his cotton, and he invented the gin; for harvesting his wheat, and he invented the reaper. He needed mechanical force to navigate his long rivers and broad lakes, and he converted the steam engine into a marine power. He needed dispatch in communicating intelligence, and he placed his lightning-rod horizontally, and beating it into a wire, converted it into a writing telegraph.

Fifty years ago there was no American science and no American literature. Now there is an American tenancy in every intellectual department, and none acknowledge its presence and usefulness more freely than those whose fame has least to fear from competition.

It seems to me that this intellectual development of the United States is due chiefly to the adoption of the great idea of universal emulation. Our constitutions and laws open every department of human enterprise and ambition to all citizens without respect to birth, or class, or condition, and steadily though cautiously exert a power quite effective in preventing any accidental social inequality from becoming fixed and permanent.

There still remains the question whether the moral development is coördinate with those of physical power and mind in the United States. A republic may be safe, even though it be weak, and though it be in a considerable degree intellectually inactive, as is seen in Switzerland; but a republic cannot exist without virtue.

It will not suffice to examine the question through the lens of traditional prejudice. A kind of reverence is paid by all nations to antiquity. There is no one that does not trace its lineage from the gods, or from those who were especially favored by the gods. Every people has had its age of gold, or Augustan age, or heroic age—an

age, alas! forever passed. These prejudices are not altogether unwholesome. Although they produce a conviction of declining virtue, which is unfavorable to generous emulation, yet a people at once ignorant and irreverential would necessarily become licentious. Nevertheless, such prejudices ought to be modified. It is untrue, that in the period of a nation's rise from disorder to refinement, it is not able to continually surpass itself. We see the present plainly, distinctly, with all its coarse outlines, its rough inequalities, its dark blots, and its glaring deformities. We hear all its tumultuous sounds and jarring discords. We see and hear the past, through a distance which reduces all its inequalities to a plane, mellows all its shades into a pleasing hue, and subdues even its hoarsest voices into harmony. In our own case, the prejudice is less erroneous than in most others. The revolutionary age was truly a heroic one. Its exigencies called forth the genius and the talents and the virtues of society, and they ripened amid the hardships of a long and severe trial. But there were selfishness, and vice, and factions, then, as now, although comparatively subdued and repressed. You have only to consult impartial history, to learn that neither public faith, nor public loyalty, nor private virtue, culminated at that period in our own country,[1] while a mere glance at the literature, or at the stage, or at the politics, of any European country, in any previous age, reveals the fact that it was marked, more distinctly than the present, by licentious morals and mean ambition.

Reasoning *à priori* again, as we did in another case, it is only just to infer in favor of the United States an improvement of morals from their established progress in knowledge and power; otherwise, the philosophy of society is misunderstood, and we must change all our courses, and henceforth seek safety in imbecility, and virtue in superstition and ignorance.

What shall be the test of the national morals? Shall it be the eccentricity of crimes? Certainly not; for then we must compare the criminal eccentricity of to-day with that of yesterday. The result of the comparison would be only this, that the crimes of society change with changing circumstances.

1 "I ought not to object to your reverence for your fathers, as you call them, meaning, I presume, the government, and those concerned in the direction of public affairs; much less could I be displeased at your numbering me among them. But, to tell you a very great secret, as far as I am capable of comparing the merits of different periods, I have no reason to believe that we were better than you are. We had as many poor creatures and selfish beings in proportion, among us, as you have among you; nor were there then more enlightened men, or in greater number in proportion, than there are now."—*John Adams's Letter to Josiah Quincy, Feb. 9, 1811.*

Loyalty to the state is a public virtue. Was it ever deeper-toned or more universal than it is now? I know there are ebullitions of passion and discontent, sometimes breaking out into disorder and violence; but was faction ever more effectually disarmed and harmless than it is now? There is a loyalty that springs from the affection that we bear to our native soil. This we have as strong as any people. But it is not the soil alone, nor yet the soil beneath our feet and the skies over our heads, that constitute our country. It is its freedom, equality, justice, greatness and glory. Who among us is so low as to be insensible of an interest in them? Four hundred thousand natives of other lands every year voluntarily renounce their own sovereigns, and swear fealty to our own. Who has ever known an American to transfer his allegiance permanently to a foreign power?

The spirit of the laws, in any country, is a true index to the morals of the people, just in proportion to the power they exercise in making them. Who complains, here or elsewhere, that crime or immorality blots our statute-books with licentious enactments?

The character of a country's magistrates, legislators, and captains, chosen by a people, reflect their own. It is true that, in the earnest canvassing which so frequently recurring elections require, suspicion often follows the magistrate, and scandal follows in the footsteps of the statesman. Yet, when his course has been finished, what magistrate has left a name tarnished by corruption, or what statesman has left an act or an opinion so erroneous that decent charity cannot excuse, though it may disapprove? What chieftain ever tempered military triumph with so much moderation as he who, when he had placed our standard on the battlements of the capital of Mexico, not only received an offer of supreme authority from the conquered nation, but declined it?

The manners of a nation are the outward form of its inner life. Where is woman held in so chivalrous respect, and where does she deserve that eminence better? Where is property more safe, commercial honor better sustained, or human life more sacred?

Moderation is a virtue in private and in public life. Has not the great increase of private wealth manifested itself chiefly in widening the circle of education and elevating the standard of popular intelligence? With forces which, if combined and directed by ambition, would subjugate this continent at once, we have made only two very

short wars—the one confessedly a war of defense, and the other ended by paying for a peace and for a domain already fully conquered.

Where lies the secret of the increase of virtue which has thus been established? I think it will be found in the entire emancipation of the consciences of men from either direct or indirect control by established ecclesiastical or political systems. Religious classes, like political parties, have been left to compete in the great work of moral education, and to entitle themselves to the confidence and affection of society, by the purity of their faith and of their morals.

I am well aware that some, who may be willing to adopt the general conclusions of this argument, will object that it is not altogether sustained by the action of the government itself, however true it may be that it is sustained by the great action of society. I cannot enter a field where truth is to be sought among the disputations of passion and prejudice. I may say, however, in reply, first, that the governments of the United States, although more perfect than any other, and although they embrace the great ideas of the age more fully than any other, are, nevertheless, like all other governments, founded on compromises of some abstract truths and of some natural rights.

As government is impressed by its constitution, so it must necessarily act. This may suffice to explain the phenomenon complained of. But it is true, also, that no government ever did altogether act out, purely and for a long period, all the virtues of its original constitution. Hence it is, that we are so well told by Bolingbroke, that every nation must perpetually renew its constitution or perish. Hence, moreover, it is a great excellence of our system that sovereignty resides, not in congress and the president, nor yet in the governments of the states, but in the people of the United States. If the sovereign be just and firm and uncorrupted, the governments can always be brought back from any aberrations, and even the constitutions themselves, if in any degree imperfect, can be amended. This great idea of the sovereignty of the people over their government glimmers in the British system, while it fills our own with a broad and glowing light.

"Let not your king and parliament in one,
Much less apart, mistake themselves for that
Which is most worthy to be thought upon,
Nor think they are essentially the STATE.
Let them not fancy that the authority

And privileges on them bestowed,
Conferr'd, are to set up a majesty,
Or a power or a glory of their own;
But let them know it was for a deeper life
Which they but represent;
That there's on earth a yet auguster thing,
Veil'd though it be, than parliament or king."

Gentlemen, you are devoted to the pursuit of knowledge in order that you may impart it to the state. What Fenelon was to France, you may be to your country. Before you teach, let me enjoin upon you to study well the capacity and the disposition of the American people. I have tried to prove to you only that, while they inherit the imperfections of humanity, they are yet youthful, apt, vigorous, and virtuous, and, therefore, that they are worthy, and will make noble uses of your best instructions.

THE PILGRIMS AND LIBERTY.[1]

SOCIETY and government are mutually related and inseparable. The material, intellectual, moral and spiritual conditions of every people, determine, through either a direct exercise of their will or their passive consent, the nature and form of their government. Reasoning from the attributes of the Creator and from the constitution of man, we justly conclude that a high stage of social happiness is attainable, and that beneficent government is therefore ultimately possible. Any different theory makes the hopes which sustain virtue delusive, and the Deity, who inspires them, a demon, equally to be feared and hated. Experience, however, teaches us that the advances of mankind toward such happiness and government are very slow. Poetry, indeed, often presents to us pleasing scenes of national felicity; but these are purely imaginary, while history is an almost unrelieved narrative of political crimes and public dangers and calamities.

We discover, by induction, moral laws as inflexible as the material laws of the universe. We know, therefore, that the tardiness of political progress results from a failure thus far to discover or apply those moral laws. The failure, at first view, excites surprise. Social melioration is apparently an object of general and intense desire. Certainly, the arts which subserve material safety, subsistence and comfort, have been eminently improved. We construct useful engines recently conceived; we search the whole surface of the round earth with comparative ease; we know the appointed courses and seasons of worlds which we can scarcely see. It is doubtful whether the arts of architecture, painting, sculpture and poetry, are susceptible of higher perfection. Why, then, does political science remain obscure, and the art of government uncertain and perplexed.

It happens, in some degree, because material wants have hitherto exacted excessive care; in some degree, because the advantages which

1 An oration at Plymouth, December 21, 1855.

result from political improvements are indirect and diffusive; but chiefly because the science is in its nature recondite, and the art intrinsically difficult.

Metaphysics is a science confessedly abstruse, and generally regarded as irksome and fruitless. Lord Bacon so pronounces, and he explains: "For the wit and mind of man, if it work upon matter, which is the contemplation of the creatures of God, worketh according to the stuff, and is limited thereby; but if it work upon itself, as the spider worketh his web, then it is endless, and brings forward, indeed, cobwebs of learning, admirable for the fineness of thread and work, but of no substance or profit." How could the study of groups be either easier or more satisfactory than that of individual man? The same philosopher confesses that "government is a part of knowledge, secret and retired."

Consider only one state. Its magnitude is immense, its outlines are indistinct, it is without symmetry of parts; its principles and dispositions are a confused aggregate of the imperfectly understood principles and dispositions of many thousands or even many millions of men. The causes which have chiefly given form and direction to these principles and dispositions are either unknown or forgotten; those which are now modifying them are too subtle for our examination. The future of states involves further conditions, which lie outside of the range of human foresight, and therefore are called accidents. Human life is short, while the process of induction in political science reaches through generations, and even ages. Philosophers seldom enjoy facilities for that process. Hence, they "make imaginary laws for imaginary commonwealths, and their discourses are as the stars, which give little light, because they are so high." Statesmen, on the contrary, "write according to the states where they live, what is received law, and not what ought to be law."

A constitutional alteration is often necessary to secure a desirable social improvement; but such an alteration cannot be made without a previous change of public opinion in the state, and even of opinion in surrounding states; for nations are social persons, and members of a universal commonwealth. Habit resists such changes. Timidity, though looking forward, is short-sighted; and with far-sighted veneration, which always looks backward, opposes such changes. Laws, however erroneous, or however arbitrarily established, acquire a supposed sanctity from the ceremony of their enactment, and

derive great strength from protracted acquiescence. In a despotic state, no subject can move changes. In a free one, each member may oppose, and opponents more easily combine than advocates. Ambition is the ruling passion of states. It is blind to defects and dangers, while hurrying them on in careers of aggression and aggrandizement. The personal interests and ambitions of many effective members of the state cling to its institutions, however erroneous or injurious, and protect them against innovation. Reform can only appeal to reason and conscience. Conservatism arouses prejudice, cupidity and fear, and adroitly excites and directs hatred against the person of the reformer. Retaliation too naturally follows; and so the controversy, which properly ought to be a public and dispassionate one, changes imperceptibly into a heated conflict of factions. Humanity and benevolence are developed only with increasing knowledge and refinement. Hence, castes and classes long remain; and these, although all equally interested in a proposed melioration, are, by an artful direction of their mutual antipathies, made to defeat it by their implacable contentions. Material interests are immediately roused and combined in opposition, because they suffer from the least disturbance. The benefits of a social change are more distant, and therefore distrusted and undervalued. The law of progress certainly does not require changes of institutions to be made at the cost of public calamities, or even of great private inconveniences. But that law is, nevertheless, inexorable. A necessary reformation will have its way, peacefully if favored, violently, if resisted. In this sense, the Founder of Christianity confessed that he had come upon the earth to bring, not peace, but a sword. Revolutions are not divinely appointed attendants of progress, nor is liberty necessarily born of social convulsion, and baptized with blood. Revolutions, on the contrary, are the natural penalties for unwise persistence in error, and servile acquiescence in injustice and oppression. Such revolutions, moreover, are of doubtful success. Most men engage readily enough in civil wars, and for a flash are hot and active; but they cool from natural unsteadiness of temper, and abandon their objects, and, destitute alike of principle, honor and true courage, betray themselves, their associates, and even their cause, however just and sacred. Happily, however, martial revolutions do not always fail. In some cases, the tempers and dispositions of the nation undergo a propitious change; it becomes generous, brave and self-denying, and free-

dom consequently gains substantial and enduring triumphs. It is hard, in such cases, to separate the share of fortune from that of merit, in analyzing the characters of heroes. Nor is it absolutely necessary. The martial heroism of such revolutions is wisely honored, even with exaggeration, because such honors stimulate a virtuous and healthful emulation. Mankind seek out the noblest among the successful champions, and investing him with imaginary excellence in addition to his real merit, set him apart as an object of universal veneration to the world's end. We recognize such impersonations in Tell and Alfred, in Wallace and Washington.

These successful martial revolutions, however, only consummate changes which were long before projected and prepared by bold, thoughtful, earnest and persevering reformers. There is justly due, therefore, to these reformers, at least some of the homage which redeemed nations award to their benefactors. We shall increase that tribute, if we reflect that the sagacity which detects the roots and causes from which national calamities and thraldoms spring, and proceeds calmly to remove them, and to avert the need of an ultimate sanguinary remedy, or prepare that remedy so that it shall be effectual, combines the merits of genius, of prudence and humanity, with those of patriotism. Our admiration of these reformers will rise still higher when we remember that they always are eminently good men, denied the confidence and sympathies of the country which they are endeavoring to save. They are necessarily good men, because only such can love freedom heartily.

"All others love, not freedom, but license, which never hath more scope or indulgence than under tyrants. Hence it is that tyrants are not often offended, nor stand much in doubt of bad men, as being all naturally servile; but in whom virtue and true worth most is eminent, these they fear in earnest, as by right their masters. Against these lie all their hatred and suspicion. Consequently, neither do bad men hate tyrants, but have been always readiest, with their falsified names of loyalty and obedience, to color over their base compliances."

The devotion of these real authors of all beneficent revolutions to the melioration of human society is, therefore, the most perfect and impressive form of magnanimity.

I know very well that this estimate is not generally allowed; nor is the injustice of the case peculiar. It occurs in all other departments of activity. We justly honor the name of Watt, who applied the ascertained mechanical power of steam to the service of the use-

ful arts of social life—and the memory of Fulton, who converted the steam engine into a marine power, and sent it abroad on all lakes, rivers and oceans, an agent of commerce, knowledge, civilization and freedom. Yet we seldom recall the previous and indispensable studies of the Marquis of Worcester, who announced his invention of the steam engine itself in those words, as full of piety and benevolence as of joy:

"Thanks to God, next to those which are due for creation and redemption, for having vouchsafed an insight into so great a secret of nature, beneficial to all mankind, as this water-commanding engine."

We cheerfully accord renown to Morse, who produced the electric telegraph; but we are prone to forget that Franklin discovered the germ of that great invention, by boldly questioning the awe-inspiring lightnings in their native skies.

There is abundant excuse for the popular neglect of peaceful social reformers. Either they are engaged in apparently idle and visionary speculations, or else occupied in what seems even more absurd, an obstinate contention with the prevailing political philosophy of their age. Those speculations assume the consistency of science—that contention, the dignity of knowledge—only when, in some later age, the principles they announced have been established. In the meantime, they pass for malcontents and fanatics. The rude taste of society generally delights in themes and characters which are sounding, marvelous, and magnificent; and prefers the march, the camp, the siege, the surprise, the sortie, the charge, the battle, with its quickly vibrating fortunes—the victory, the agonies of the night which follows it, and the pomp and revelry of the day which banishes the complaining memories of that fearful night—to the humanitarian's placid studies, or the bewildering debates of polemic politics.

Excusable, however, as the injustice is, which I have described, it is, nevertheless, unwise and injurious. It discourages necessary, noble and generous efforts, and is chief among the bulwarks of superstition and despotism. The energies of men can never remain stationary. A nation that will not tolerate the activity of intellectual energy in the pursuit of political truth, must expect the study of that truth to cease. A nation that has ceased to produce original and inventive minds, restless in advancing the landmarks of knowledge and freedom, from that moment has begun to recede towards igno-

rance and slavery. Every stage backwards renders its return more hopeless.

I am sure that this great error will not last always, and yet I do not think it is near its end. How long it shall endure, is known only to Him who, although He commands us to sow and to plant with undoubting faith that we shall reap and gather the fruits of our culture, reserves to Himself, nevertheless, not only the control, but even the knowledge, of the forthcoming seasons.

It is because I am unwilling to forego a proper occasion for disavowing that error, that I am here to celebrate, over the graves of the Forefathers, on this day, devoted to their memories, the virtues, the labors, and the sufferings of the Puritans of New England and Old England. My interest in the celebration is not, like your own, a derived, but only a reflected one. I am not native here, nor was I born to the manner of this high and holy observance. The dogmatical expositions of the Christian scheme pronounced by the Puritans have not altogether commanded my acceptance. I shall, therefore, refrain from even an approach to those finer parts of my great theme, justly familiar to your accustomed orators, which reach the profoundest depths of reverence and love in the bosoms of the lineal descendants of the founders of New England. A few years after the death of Napoleon, I stood before the majestic column in the Place Vendome, that lifts his statue high above the capital of France. When I asked who scattered there a thousand wreaths of flowers, freshly gathered, that covered its base, the answer came quickly back, "All the world." So I, one only of the same vast constituency, cheerfully cast my garland upon the tomb of the Pilgrims, and lend my voice to aid your noble purpose of erecting here a worthier and more deserved monument to the memory of the Pilgrims. It is, indeed, quite unnecessary to their fame; yet it is, alas, only too necessary to correct the basis of the world's judgment of heroic worth. Make its foundations broad as the domain which the adventurers of the Mayflower peacefully, and without injustice, rescued from the tramp of savage tribes! Let its material be of the imperishable substance of these everlasting hills! Let its devices and descriptions be colossal, as becomes the emblems and tributes which commemorate a world's ever-upheaving deliverance from civil and religious despotism! Let its shaft rise so high that it shall cast its alternate shadows, changing with the progress of the sun in his journey, across the

Atlantic and over the intervening mountains to the Pacific coast! It must, even then, borrow majesty from the rock which was the first foothold of the Pilgrims on these desolate shores, instead of imparting to it sublimity.

But I may not touch the domestic story of your ancestors. Only a Jewish hand could strike the cymbals with the boldness due to the theme of the march of the host of Israel, under the guidance of its changeful pillar of cloud and of fire, while pursued by the chariots and horsemen of Egypt, through the divinely divided floods of the Arabian sea; or, without temerity almost sacrilegious, lift from the waving boughs the harps which the daughters of Jerusalem hung upon the willows, while by the side of the rivers of Assyria they sat down, and wept the piteous captivity of their nation, beloved, but temporarily forsaken of God.

It is a sure way of promoting knowledge and virtue, as well as of rising to greatness and goodness, to study with due care and reverence the operation of sublime principles of conduct in advancing the progress of mankind. I desire so to contemplate the working of the leading principle of the Puritans

I confess that the Puritans neither disclosed nor discovered any new truths of morals or of government. None such have been discovered, at least since the Divine Teacher set forth the whole system of private and public ethics among the olive groves, on that one which was his favorite among the mountains that look down upon Jerusalem.

Nor was it their mission to institute a new progress of mankind. Although the eastern nations, the first to enjoy the light of civilization, had, long before the age of the Puritans, sunk into that deep sleep from which there is as yet no awaking, yet Europe was even then full of energy, enterprise and hope. The better elements of the oriental and mediterranean civilizations had survived and, coöperating with the pure influences of Christianity, were enlightening and refining the southern and western nations. The western church, which until recently was unpartitioned, had long defended the faith against the Saracens, and protected feeble states against the aggressions of ambitious princes. It still held the nations in the bonds of a common fraternity. Nor had it forgotten to proselyte after the primitive manner, by inculcating morality and charity. It had, by its potent command, addressed to the conscience of

Christendom, abolished throughout Europe that system of personal servitude in which a large, perhaps the largest, portion of every community had been held, under every form of government. It bore its testimony steadily against that system, everywhere declaring that "God and nature equally cry out against human slavery; that serfs and slaves are a part of the human family which Christ died to redeem; and that equality is an essential incident of that brotherhood which he enjoins as a test by which his disciples shall be known."

The foundations of that comprehensive international code, which is now everywhere accepted, were broadly laid. It was then clearly taught that "there are in nature certain fountains of justice, from which all pure civil laws flow, varying only in this, that as waters take tinctures and tastes from the soils through which they run, so do civil laws differ according to the regions and governments where they are planted." Luther had already summoned Europe to a new and more vigorous morality, and Calvin's sharp voice was ringing through the continent, calling the faithful away from all ostentatious ceremonies of worship, to that pure and spiritual one which God prefers "before all temples." The feudal policy, although founded in very imperfect conceptions of civil society, had saved, through the recent decline, many personal and political rights and privileges which otherwise would have been swept away, as they were in Asia, by the desolating hand of absolute power. Chivalry, a wild vine, engrafted upon Christianity, was bearing abundant fruits of courage, constancy, gallantry, munificence, honor and clemency. The machinery of mercenary armies was not yet perfected, and the security of government was still held to depend, not on laws and force, but on the approval and sympathies of the people. Commerce had discovered that the oceans were designed, not to separate, but to unite nations, and was extending its field over all habitable climes, and taking on the dignity of its new functions as an auxiliary of empire. Manufactures had been incorporated as a distinct wheel in the enginery of national wealth; and the productive classes had already attained a position among the ruling elements of states. A wise policy of liberal naturalization was breaking up local septs and clans, and distributing the seeds of material and social improvement throughout both hemispheres. Indolence, expense and faction, had prepared that decline of aristocratic orders which still continues. Just notions of the free tenure of lands, and even that great idea of

the universal freedom of labor, which is now agitating the world, prevailed quite widely. Italy,

"The dark'ned ages' last remaining light,"

had never failed to present examples of republican institutions. The monarchical constitutions of that period contained sharply-defined limitations, and they were vigorously guarded and defended. It was a general theory, that the subject could not be taxed without consent of the legislature, and that princes could only govern in conformity to laws. England especially had a parliament, the type of modern legislatures, trial by jury, magna charta and the common law, constituting one fourfold and majestic arch for the support of civil liberty. She had, moreover, emancipated herself from the supremacy of the See of Rome, and the popular mind was intently engaged equally in the pursuit of theological truth, and in the application of the organic laws to the maintenance and defence of public and private rights.

It was the age of Spenser, Shakspeare, Bacon and Milton. Poetry had risen from lyric beauty to epic dignity; history, from fabulous chronicle to philosophical argument; and learning, from words and forms, to things and laws. Reasoning from these circumstances, it seemed that the onward progress of society was assured, and that civil and religious liberty were about to be established on broad and enduring foundations.

Nevertheless, a reaction had already begun, whose force is even yet unspent. The See of Rome took alarm from the movement of the reformation, and combined with kings against nations. Henry VIII arrogated to himself the very same spiritual supremacy, which, with the aid of the people and in the name of Christian liberty, he had wrested from the pope; and with singular caprice employed it in compelling conformity to the obnoxious faith and worship of Rome, conducted by ecclesiastics who derived their appointments from himself, and held them at his own pleasure. The reign of Mary inaugurated that relapse to Rome, which the caprices of Henry had rendered inevitable. Elizabeth reinstalled the reformation, but renewed the regal claim to spiritual supremacy. The people resisted all these ecclesiastical usurpations of the Tudors, and they, in retaliation, boldly attempted to subvert the constitutional authority of parliament. Elizabeth, under the advice of sagacious

statesmen, and supported by temporizing churchmen, resorted to the favorite expedient of politicians—compromise. Compromise is a feasible and often a necessary mode of adjusting conflicting material interests, but can never justly be extended to the subversion of the natural rights or the moral duties of subjects or citizens. Even where a compromise is proper in itself, it derives all its strength from the fair and full consent of all the parties whom it binds. Elizabeth caused the Roman Catholic creed, discipline and ritual to be revised and altogether recast, under the direction of leaders of some of the conflicting sects; and thus a new system was produced, which, as was claimed, stood midway between the uncompromising church of Rome and equally uncompromising latitudinarian Protestantism. The new system was established by law, and a hierarchy was appointed by the crown, to whose care it was committed. Absolute and even active conformity was commanded to be enforced by pains and penalties in special and unconstitutional tribunals, acting without appeal, and in derogation of the common law. The new system, whatever might be its religious and ecclesiastical harmony with the Divine precepts, was, in its civil aspects, a mere political institution. It was offensive and odious to a zealous people, who, though divided into opposing sects, agreed in regarding the political authority assumed by the state as a sacrilegious usurpation. The friends of civil liberty also condemned it, as a turning of the batteries that had been won from the Roman See, in the name of liberty, against the very fortress of liberty itself. Nevertheless, a portion of the clergy, who had now become dependent on the state, members of the privileged classes, always disinclined to political agitation, placemen and waiters for places, the timid, the venal and the frivolous, early gave in their adhesion, and the compromise daily gained wider acquiescence, through the appliances of political seduction, proscription and persecution. The Church of England was built on that compromise. Incorporated into the constitution with such auxiliary political powers, it must necessarily augment the influence of the throne, and be subversive equally of the civil and religious liberties of the people.

A conservative power, a new conservative power, was necessary to prevent that fatal consummation. That power appeared in the form of a body of obscure religious sectaries, men of monastical devoutness, yet retaining the habits of domestic and social life; simple, but

not unlearned; unambitious; neither rich enough to forget their God, nor yet poor enough to debase their souls; content with mechanical and agricultural occupations in villages and rural districts, yet conscious of the liberty with which Christ had made them free, and therefore bold enough to confront ecclesiastical and even royal authority in the capital. Serious, as became their religious profession, they grew under persecution to be grave, formal and austere. Chosen emissaries of God, as they believed, they willingly became outcasts among men. Divinely constituted depositaries of pure and abounding truth, as they thought, they announced, as their own rule of conduct, that no article of faith, no exercise of ecclesiastical authority, no rule of discipline, and not even a shred of ceremonial or sacrament, should be accepted, unless sanctioned by direct warrant from the Scriptures, as interpreted by themselves, in the free exercise of their own consciences, illuminated by the Holy Spirit. God, although a benevolent Father, was yet, as they believed, jealous towards disobedience of His revealed will, and would punish conscious neglect of its commandments. These were the Puritans. They came into the world to save it from despotism; and the world comprehended them not. They refused to acquiesce in the compromise, because it involved a surrender of natural rights, and a violation of principles of duty toward God. Nevertheless, they were true Christians, and, therefore, they declined to set up their own convictions as a standard for others who subscribed to the Christian faith, and freely allowed to all their fellow subjects the same broad religious liberty which they claimed for themselves. They persisted in non-conformity. The more hardly pressed, the more firmly they persisted. The more firm their persistence, the more severe and unrelenting was the persecution they endured. More than a hundred years virtually outlawed as citizens and subjects, and outcasts from the established church, the Puritans bore unflinchingly their unwavering testimony against the compromise, before magistrates and councils, in the pillory, under stripes, in marches, in camps, in prison, in flight, in exile, among licentious soldiery and dissolute companions in neighboring lands; on the broad and then unexplored ocean, when the mariners lost their reckoning, and the ship's supplies became scanty and her seams opened to the waves; on unknown coasts, homeless, houseless, famishing and dying; in the leafless forest, surrounded by ice and snow, fearful of savage beasts and con-

fronting savage men. The compromise policy failed. Civil and religious liberty was not overborne; it rose erect; it triumphed; it is still gaining new and wider and more enduring triumphs; and tyrants have read anew the lesson, so often wasted upon them before, that where mankind stand upon their convictions of moral right and duty, in disobedience to civil authority, there is no middle course of dealing with them between the persecution that exterminates and the toleration that satisfies. The Puritans were not exterminated—they were not satisfied.

The Puritans thus persisted and prevailed because they had adopted one true, singular and sublime principle of civil conduct, namely, that the subject in every state has a natural right to religious liberty of conscience. They knew too well the weakness of human guaranties of civil liberty, and the frailty of civil barriers against tyranny. They, therefore, did not affect to derive the right of toleration from the common law, or the statutes of the realm, or magna charta, or even from that imaginary contract between the sovereign and the subject which some publicists had, about that time, invented as a basis for civil rights. They resorted directly to a law, broader, older and more stable than all these—a law, universal in its application and in its obligation, established by the Creator and Judge of all men, and, therefore, paramount to all human constitutions. Algernon Sidney, Locke and Bacon, and even Hooker, chosen and ablest champion of the church of England, demonstrated the existence of this law, deriving the evidences of it, and of its universal nature and application, from natural and revealed religion, in the high debates of the seventeenth century. Blackstone, Vattel and Montesquieu, have built upon it their respective systems of municipal law, public law, and government; and our own congress of 1776 sunk into the same enduring foundation the corner-stone of this vast and towering structure of American freedom. The Puritans could, therefore, lay no claim to the discovery of this great principle, or to the promulgation of it. But the distinguished glory of having first reduced it from speculation to active and effectual application, as a conventional rule of political conduct, is all their own.

This great principle was not only a disturbing, but it was also an offensive and annoying one. It was an appeal from the highest sovereign power in the state to a sovereign power still higher, and therefore was thought seditious. It, of course, encountered then the same

ingenious sophistry which, although often overthrown, has not even yet been silenced. It was argued that, if individual conscience may rightly refuse to acquiesce in the results of the general conviction collected by the state and established as law, it may also rightfully resist the law by force, which would produce disorder and lead to anarchy. It was argued, also, that, insomuch as civil government is of divine appointment, it must be competent to act as an arbiter between conflicting consciences, and that implicit obedience to its decrees, as such arbiter, is, therefore, a religious duty. As well might have been foreseen, there arose, on the side of the Puritans, contestants worthy of the majestic principle they defended—contestants, whose voices, then silenced by persecution or drowned by public clamor, have reached this more congenial age, and are now giving form and condensation to the whole science of political ethics. Not again recalling the names of Locke and Sidney, there were Edwards, profoundest metaphysician of all ages, and Milton, always discontented and distrusted among men, but familiar with angels, and learned in the counsels of Heaven. It was their sufficient reply, that unenlightened and unsanctified consciences will never disturb despotism with their remonstrances, and that consciences illuminated and purified cannot be perverted to error; that God has delegated to no human tribunal authority to interfere between Himself and the monitor which He has implanted in the bosom of every moral being, and which is responsible to its Author alone; and that the boundaries of human authority are the boundaries of Eternal justice, ascertained by the teachings of that monitor which, where it is free and fully awakened, must always be the same. They answered further, and with decisive energy, that traditions and compacts subversive of freedom were altogether void, because the masses of men living at one time in a state, must always have supreme control over their own conduct, in all that concerns their duty to God and their own happiness.

Fortunately, the Puritans had keen sagacity. They would not ask liberty of conscience as a political concession; because, if granted as such, it might be revoked. Fortunately they were not purposely a political or civil body, but a purely religious one; a church in the wilderness, as they described themselves; a church without secular combinations, interests or ends; a church with no interest but duty, no end but to avoid the Divine disfavor, and no head but God. Fortunately, also, the age was as yet a religious one. Skepticism, which

has since so wildly overrun large portions of Europe, and scattered its poison even here, had not then entered the world; and the plenary nature and authority of the Holy Scriptures, to which the Puritans appealed, was universally acknowledged. It was especially felicitous that the lives of the Puritans vindicated their sincerity, magnanimity and piety. Equally in domestic and social life, and in the great transactions of the state in which they became concerned, their conduct was without fear and without reproach. With all these advantages, the Puritans, as naturally as wisely, referred themselves to the Divine revelations for the principle which they promulgated. With effective simplicity, they confined themselves to the main point in debate. They neither pretended to define nor to make summaries of all the natural rights of man which tyranny might invade, nor to trace out the ultimate secular consequences of the great principle on which they insisted. They rested the defense of the one natural right which was distinctly invaded, on no grounds of expediency or of public utility, but on the grounds alone that God had given it, and that man could not either invade or surrender it, without sin against the Divine majesty. It was the peculiarity of the right thus invaded and defended, that lent to the Puritans their crowning advantage. Religion is the profoundest and most universal affection of our nature. Apparently the cause of innumerable differences and endless controversies, it is, nevertheless, the one common and principal element which controls the actions of all men. It sustained the Puritans. It gradually won for them the respect and sympathies of men and of nations. The right assailed brought equally conscience and the love of liberty, the two most elastic and enduring springs of activity, into resistance. Its invasion was sacrilegious, because it assumed to add to the Divine commandments, and to take away from disobedience to them the curses that are written against it in the Book of Life. Primitive apostolical eloquence, which reminds us of the inspired apology of Paul before Agrippa, revived in its defense. The Puritans spake from their prisons after this manner:

"Upon a careful examination of the Holy Scriptures, we find the English hierarchy to be different from Christ's institution, and to be derived from Antichrist, being the same the pope left in this land, to which we dare not subject ourselves. We farther find that God has commanded all that believe the gospel to walk in that holy path and order which he has appointed in his church. Wherefore, in the

reverend fear of his name, we have joined ourselves together, and subjected our souls and bodies to those laws and ordinances, and have chosen to ourselves such a ministry of pastors, teachers, elders and deacons, as Christ has given to his church on earth to the world's end, hoping for the promised assistance of his grace in our attendance upon him, notwithstanding any prohibition of men, or what by men can be done unto us. We are ready to prove our church order to be warranted by the word of God, allowable by her majesty's laws, and no ways prejudicial to the sovereign power, and to disprove the public hierarchy, worship and government, by such evidence as our adversaries shall not be able to withstand, protesting, if we fail herein, not only willingly to sustain such deserved punishment as shall be inflicted upon us, but to become conformable for the future, if we overthrow not our adversaries. * * * We therefore, in the name of God and of our sovereign the queen, pray that we may have the benefit of the laws and of the public charters of the land, namely, that we may be received to bail, till we be by order of law convicted of some crime deserving of bonds. We plight our faith unto God, and our allegiance to her majesty, that we will not commit anything unworthy of the gospel of Christ, or to the disturbance of the common peace and good order of the land, and that we will be forthcoming at such reasonable warning as your lordship shall command. Oh, let us not perish before trial and judgment, especially imploring and crying out to you for the same. However, we take the Lord of heaven and earth, and his angels, together with your own consciences and all persons in all ages, to whom this our supplication may come, to witness that we have here truly advertised your honors of our case and maze, and have in all humility offered to come to Christian trial."

How sublimely, and yet with touching effect does this opening of their cause by the Puritans illustrate the Divine instruction that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom!

Let us consider now the scope and the full import of the Puritan principle. That scope is not narrowed by any failure of the Puritans themselves to comprehend it, or even by any neglect on their part to cover it fully in their own political conduct. Christianity is the same, however narrowed or perverted by erroneous creeds or practices among the faithful. Nor is the real merit of the Puritans diminished, because they did not fully comprehend all possible applications of the principle they maintained. Human progress is only the following of an endless chain, suspended from the throne of God. The links of that chain are infinite in number. The human hand can grasp only one of them at once.

The Puritan principle of the inviolability of the right of conscience, necessarily covers the inviolability of all the acknowledged natural rights of man, as well those which concern his duty to himself and his duty to others, as those which arise out of his direct duties toward God. Certainly the Creator and Ruler of the Uni

verse, the beneficent Father and Preserver of all life, the universal Lawgiver and Judge of all moral beings, is not in any human sense a jealous and exacting God, incensed by the withholding of homage due to Himself, and yet regardless of the neglect of other human duties which He has prescribed. Assuredly, when He commands us not only to walk humbly before Himself, but also to perfect our own nature, and to do justice, and love mercy toward other men, He has given us the same absolute right to the free exercise of our faculties, in performing these latter duties, that He has given us for the performance of the first. Nor is there any homage to God so acceptable as the upright heart and pure. He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?

The Puritan principle further involves the political equality of all men. Absolute rights arise out of the moral constitution of man. There is only one moral constitution of all men. The absolute rights of all men are therefore the same. Political equality is nothing else than the full enjoyment, by every member of the state, of the absolute rights which belong equally to all men. Any abridgment of that equality, on whatever consideration, except by discriminating justice in the punishment of crimes, is therefore forbidden to human government by the Divine authority. The Puritans so understood their own great principle, in its bearing upon the right of conscience.

"Liberty of conscience (said one of their earliest organs) is the natural right of every man. * * * He that will look back on past times, and examine into the true causes of the subversion and devastation of states and countries, will find it owing to the tyranny of princes and the persecution of priests. The ministers of the established church say, 'If we tolerate one sect, we must tolerate all.' This is true. They have as good a right to their consciences as to their clothes or estates. No opinions or sentiments of religion are cognizable by the magistrates, any further than they are inconsistent with the peace of civil government."

But this latitude of the principle of tolerance has been always vigorously and efficiently opposed by prejudice, pride and bigotry, in every church, in every sect, in every state and under every form of government. Each sect has claimed liberty of conscience for itself as a natural right, but with gross inconsistency, which invalidated its own argument, has denied that liberty to other sects—as if the Supreme Ruler had made men to agree, instead of differing, upon

non-essential as well as upon essential articles of religious faith. The principle has nevertheless continually gained, and is still gaining fresh triumphs. After a long contest in England, toleration was granted to all but Roman Catholics and Jews. One hundred and fifty years after the organization of the Puritans, the principle entered into all the American constitutions. Fifty years later, it emancipated the Roman Catholics throughout Great Britain. Only a year ago, it removed the disfranchisement of the Jews in the British dominions. It has thus irrevocably become a part of the constitution of that great empire.

The Puritan principle draws closely after it the consequence of an absolute separation of church and state, for the reason that the toleration of conscience can in no other way be practically and completely established. That separation has been made in the American constitutions, with abundant advantage to both the cause of religion and the cause of good government. Great Britain is advancing steadily toward the adoption of the same broad, just and beneficent policy. The separation of church and state may therefore be regarded as a contribution made by the Puritans towards perfecting the art of government.

The political equality of men has also met with obstinate resistance, and has also achieved many and auspicious triumphs. After one hundred and fifty years of controversy, it was carried into the British constitution by the judicial decision in Somerset's case, that a slave could not breathe the air of England. Ten or fifteen years later, it was theoretically adopted and promulgated in the declaration of American independence. The suppression of the African slave trade, by conventions of the states of Christendom, transferred the same principle to the law of nations. The abolition of African slavery by all of the European nations, and, with few exceptions, also by all of the American states, is indicative of the universal adoption of the same great principle by all Christian nations, at some period not far distant.

You are now prepared, I trust, for another and still more comprehensive view of the Puritan principle, namely: that its full and perfect development is the pure system of republican government. Such was its marked tendency in the beginning. "A generous disdain of one man's will," says a truly philosophical writer, "is to republics what chastity is to woman, a conservative principle, not to

be argued upon or subjected to calculations of utility." Puritanism was a protest against the will of one man, whether that man was Pope or King. What form of government, other than the pure republic, can there be where there is complete separation of church and state and where absolute political equality prevails? Abolish the connection of church and state and all political distinctions between the members of the state, in any of the kingdoms or empires of Europe, and what would remain, or could exist there, but a pure republic? If the argument is not yet conclusive, consider then that the Puritan principle tends to the pure republic, by virtue of its conservative protection of the individual member of the state against its corporate oppression; by virtue, also, of its elevation of individual conscience, thus bringing down the importance of the aggregate mass, and raising the personal importance and dignity of the subject or citizen; by virtue of the importance it attaches to personal rights, exalting them above material interests, and so making those rights, and not property, the primary object of the care of government; and by virtue, still further, of the openness, directness and frankness of conduct which it requires. Equal tolerance in religion, and equal enjoyment of the other absolute rights of man, are inconsistent with the secrecy and fraud which monarchy and aristocracy necessarily employ, and cannot endure private councils or cabals. The Puritan principle tends to the pure republic still more obviously, because it seeks to abridge the powers of government, and substitute consent and free acquiescence as the bonds of union between the members of the state, instead of armed or military force. This operation of the principle is happily illustrated in our own republic, which, although constituted by an ever-increasing number of distinct states, has, nevertheless, been held together eighty years, and is, I trust, to be held together forever, without, for that purpose, even the shadow of a standing army, an anomaly as pleasing as it is full of profitable instruction.

Let it be confessed that the Puritans, as a body, were slow to discern these consequences and tendencies. They disclaimed them long and with unquestionable sincerity.

"Although (said they to Elizabeth) Her Majesty be incensed against us, as if we would obey no laws, we take the Lord of heaven and earth to witness that we acknowledge, from the bottom of our hearts, Her Majesty to be our lawful Queen placed over us for our good; and we give God our most humble and hearty thanks

for her happy government; and both in public and private we constantly pray for her prosperity. We renounce all foreign power, and acknowledge Her Majesty's supremacy to be lawful and just. We detest all error and heresy. Yet we desire that Her Majesty will not think us disobedient, seeing we suffer ourselves to be displaced rather than yield to some things required. Our bodies and goods, and all we have are in Her Majesty's hands; only our souls which we reserve to our God, who is able to save and condemn us."

Long afterward, and after the Puritans in America had practically enjoyed a pure republican government through some generations, the colony of Massachusetts saluted Charles II. on his restoration, with this loyal address:

"To enjoy our liberty, and to walk according to the faith and order of the gospel, was the cause of us transplanting ourselves with our wives, our little ones and our substance, choosing the pure Christian worship, with a good conscience in this remote wilderness, rather than the pleasures of England with submission to the impositions of the hierarchy, to which we could not yield without an evil conscience. We are not seditious to the interests of Cæsar."

Nevertheless, the reluctance of the Puritans to admit the full tendencies of their principle cannot justly excite surprise. We necessarily fear, and feel our way, when we are treading on unknown ground, or in the dark. "Let no one who begins an innovation," says Machiavelli, "expect that he shall stop it at his pleasure, or regulate it according to his intention." The Puritans never aimed to be, and never consciously were secular or political reformers. Their field of labor, as they bounded it, lay all within the church of Christ. They sought not an earthly republic, but only the kingdom of heaven. When sometimes the thought presented itself, that, by reason of their fidelity to their profession, a purer and better political state would arise out of the commotions through which they were passing, it seemed still to them a merely secondary object, subordinate to the one sole religious purpose for which they had combined. We all have learned how slowly the sentiment of independence, and the principle of republicanism, ripened in these colonies during the early stages of the revolutionary contest, and how these free institutions rose suddenly under the hands of a people who were even yet protesting an enduring loyalty to the throne and parliament of Great Britain. It was not so, however, with the master spirits, Adams, Otis and Jefferson. Nor was it so in the case of the Puritans with Milton.

"No man (said he), who knows aught, can be so stupid to deny that all men naturally were born free, being the image and resemblance of God himself, and were, by privilege above all the creatures, born to command and not to obey. The power of kings and magistrates is nothing else but what is only derivative, transferred and committed to them in trust from the people, to the common good of them all, in whom the power yet fundamentally remains and cannot be taken from them, without a violation of their natural birthright."

How, then, has it happened that civil consequences so vast have followed the merely religious action of the Puritans? The apparent mystery is easily explained. Civil liberty is an object of universal and intense desire. The cause of the Puritans identified itself with the cause of civil liberty in England, and ultimately, though on their part unconsciously, became the leading element of that cause, both in Europe and America. Thus identified and eminent the Puritan cause effected the establishment of a republic which endured through a short but glorious period in England. Though the British nation soon relapsed, and monarchy was restored, yet the Puritan principle, nevertheless, modified the constitution, and gave to it the popular form which it now bears. A throne yet towers above that edifice, but it is no longer the throne of the Stuarts or of the Tudors, or even of the Plantagenets. It is simply ornamental. The lords, spiritual and temporal, still constitute distinct estates, and retain their ancient dignity. But their real political power and influence have passed away, and the commons, no longer contesting inch by inch for their constitutional rights, are virtually the rulers of the British empire. France oscillates so uneasily and tremulously between the republic and military despotism, that no one who is hopeful of progress doubts where the needle will settle at last. It has become a proverb, that Europe must soon be either republican or despotic. When the compromise system of limited monarchy shall have retired, and only the two systems of republicanism and despotism are left to confront each other on that continent, in an age of still increasing intellectual and moral energies, the triumph of the former, though uncertain in the points of time and manner and in regard to the field of contest, will nevertheless be assured. The Puritan principle is shaping, already, future republics on the islands and continents of the Pacific ocean, and on the heretofore neglected coasts of Africa, while the American continent is everywhere crowned with free institutions, due to its still more direct and potential influence. From Plymouth Rock to Labrador, to Magellan, and

around, by bay, gulf and headland, to Nootka Sound, the republican system, more or less developed, and more or less firmly established, pervades this hemisphere. Such are the already ripening and ripened fruits of the vigorous plants of Puritanism, gathered equally and promiscuously from the parent stock in England, and from the exotic one so carefully transplanted on this rugged coast, and so sedulously watered, watched, cherished and reared, by the Pilgrim Fathers.

Behold how the unfolding, justly and naturally, as I trust, of a theme primarily local, sectional, and even sectarian, has brought us to the solution of the great problem of the progress of mankind toward social happiness and beneficent government. That higher stage of social happiness, that purer form of republican government, to which we are tending, are but faintly shadowed forth in the disturbed transition scenes through which we are passing, and even in the most perfect institutions which have yet been framed from the confused materials of dilapidated and decaying systems. Present defects and imperfections no more warrant conclusions against that better future which has been indicated, than the incompleteness of the development of Christian principles justifies a fear of the ultimate failure of Christianity itself.

It is a law of human progress, that no work or structure proceeding from human hands shall come forth complete and perfect. Improvement, at the cost of labor and of trial, and even suffering—endless improvement, at such cost, is the discipline of human nature.

What, then, shall be the rule of our own conduct? Shall we grasp and hold fast to existing constitutions, with all their defects and deficiencies, and save them from needed amendment, or shall we amend and complete them, and so prevent reäctions, and the need of sanguinary revolutions? Shall we compromise the principles of justice, freedom, and humanity, by compliances with the counsels of interested cupidity or slavish fear, or shall we stand fast always in their defense? I know no better rule of conduct than that of the Puritans. Indeed, I know none other that is sure, or even safe. Nor can even that great rule be followed successfully without adopting their own noble temper and spirit. They were faithful, patient, and persevering. They forgot themselves, and their own immediate interests and ambitions, and labored and suffered, that after-coming

generations, among which we belong, might be safer and freer and happier than themselves. It can never be too well understood that the generations of men, in moral and political culture, sow and plant for their successors. "Let it not be grievous to you," said Bradford, the meek but brave and constant leader, to the small and forlorn Pilgrim commonwealth, that he was landing on this rock in mid-winter—"Let it not be grievous to you that you have been made instruments to break the ice for others. The honor shall be yours, to the world's end." Such was the only worldly encouragement the truthful founder of the Plymouth colony could give to his guileless comrades. Happily, the Pilgrims needed no others.

It is a familiar law of nature, that whatever grows rapidly also declines speedily. Time and trial are necessary to secure the full vigor without which no enterprise can endure. It was only by long, perilous and painful endurance and controversy, that the Puritans acquired the discipline which, without consciousness of their own, qualified them to be the leaders of the nations.

Need I add, that there can be neither great deeds nor great endurance without faith; and that true, firm, enduring faith can only be found in generous and noble minds? The true reformer, therefore, must calculate on frequent and ever-recurring treacheries and desertions by allies, such as Milton graphically describes:

> "Another sort there is, who, coming in the course of these affairs to have their share in great actions above the form of law or custom, at least to give their voice and approbation, begin to swerve and almost shiver at the majesty and grandeur of some noble deed; as if they were newly entered into a great sin, disputing precedents, forms and circumstances, when the commonwealth nigh perishes for want of deeds in substance done with just and faithful expedition. To these I wish better instruction and virtue equal to their calling."

Nor will all these qualities suffice, without discretion and gentleness as well as firmness of temper. The courageous reformer will shrink from no controversy, when the field is open, the battle is set, and the lists are fair. But, on the other hand, he will neither make nor seek occasions for activity; and he will be always unimpassioned. Truth is not aggressive; but, like the Christian religion, is first pure, then peaceable. Nor need the reformer fear that occasions for duty will be wanting. Error and injustice never fail to provoke contest; because, if unalarmed, they are overbearing and insolent; if alarmed, they are rash, passionate and reckless.

The question occurs, Whence shall come the faith, the energy, the patient perseverance, and the moderation, which are so indispensable? I answer, that all these will be derived from just conceptions of the great objects of political action. It was so with the Puritans. Their fixed purpose to retain the right of conscience, fully comprehended by them, extinguished selfishness and ambition, and called into activity in their places the fear of God and the love of man. Let them explain themselves:

"Knowing, therefore, how horrible a thing it is to fall into the hands of the living God, by doing that which our consciences (grounded upon the truth of God's Word and the example and doctrine of ancient fathers) do tell us were evil done, and to the great discrediting of the truth whereof we profess to be teachers, we have thought good to yield ourselves into the hands of men; to suffer whatsoever God hath appointed us to suffer, for the perfecting of the commandments of God and a clean conscience before the commandments of men. Not despising men, therefore, but trusting in God only, we seek to serve Him with a clear conscience so long as we shall live here, assuring ourselves that the things that we shall suffer for so doing shall be a testimony to the world that great reward is laid up for us in heaven, where we doubt not but to rest forever with those that have before our days suffered for the like."

Contrast these sentiments, so profoundly self-renouncing and reverential of God, with the blasphemous egotism of the French revolutionists of 1798, and contrast also the slowly formed and slowly maturing, but always multiplying and ripening fruits of the Puritan reformation, with the blasted and shriveled benefits of that other great modern convulsion, and you have an instructive and memorable lesson upon the elevation and purity of spirit which alone can advance human progress.

Increase of wealth and commerce, and the enlargement of empire, are not truly primary objects of the American patriot. These are, indeed, worthy of his efforts. But the first object is the preservation of the spirit of freedom, which is the soul of the republic itself. Let that become languid, and the republic itself must languish and decline. Let it become extinct, and the republic must disastrously fall. Let it be preserved and invigorated, and the republic will spread wider and wider, and its noble institutions will tower higher and higher. Let it fall, and so its example fail, and the nations will retrograde. Let it endure, and the world will yet be free, virtuous and happy. Hitherto, nations have raised monuments to survive liberty and empire. And they have been successful. Egypt, As-

syria, Greece and Italy are full of those monuments. Let our ambition be the nobler one of establishing liberty and empire which shall survive the most stupendous material structures which genius can devise or art erect, with all the facilities of increasing knowledge and public wealth.

Here my reflections on a subject infinitely suggestive come to an end. They will not be altogether fruitless, if I have been at all successful in illustrating the truths that continual meliorations of society and government are not only possible, but certain; that human progress is slow, because it is only the unfolding of the Divine Providence concerning man; that the task of directing and aiding that progress is rendered the most difficult of all our labors, by reason of our imperfect knowledge of the motives and principles of human conduct, and of countless unforeseen obstacles to be encountered; that this progress, nevertheless, must and will go on, whether favored or resisted; that it will go on peacefully, if wisely favored, and through violence, if unwisely resisted; that neither stability nor even safety, can be enjoyed by any state, otherwise than by rendering exact justice, which is nothing else than pure equality, to all its members; that the martial heroism, which, invoked after too long passiveness under oppression and misrule, sometimes achieves the deliverance of states, is worthy of all the honor it receives; but that the real authors of all benign revolutions, are those who search out and seek to remove peacefully the roots of social and political evils, and so avert the necessity for sanguinary remedies; that the Puritans of England and America have given the highest and most beneficent illustration of that conservative heroism which the world has yet witnessed; that they have done this by the adoption of a single, true and noble principle of conduct, and by patient and persevering fidelity to it; that they thus overcame a demoralizing political and social reäction, and gave a new and powerful impulse to human progress; that tyranny is deceitful, and mankind are credulous, and that therefore political compromises are more dangerous to liberty than open usurpations; that the Puritan principle, which was so sublime and so effective, was nothing else than the truth, that men retain in every state all the natural rights which are essential to the performance of personal, social and religious duties; that the principle includes the absolute equality of all men, and therefore tends to a complete development in pure republican sys-

tems; that it has already modified the institutions of Europe, while it has brought into existence republican systems, more or less perfect throughout the American continent, and is fixing and shaping such institutions wherever civilization is found; that hindrances, delays and reactions of political progress are nevertheless unavoidable, but that they also have corresponding benefits; that it is our duty to labor to advance that progress, chiefly by faith, constancy and perseverance—virtues which can only be acquired by self-renunciation, and by yielding to the motives of the fear of God and the love of mankind.

Come forward, then, ye nations, states and races—rude, savage, oppressed and despised—enslaved or mutually warring among yourselves, as ye are—upon whom the morning star of civilization hath either not yet dawned or hath only dimly broken amid clouds and storms, and receive the assurance that its shining shall yet be complete, and its light be poured down on all alike. Receive our pledges that we will wait and watch and strive for the fullness of that light, by the exercise of faith, with patience and perseverance. And ye reverend men, whose precious dust is beneath our unworthy feet, pilgrims and sojourners in this vale of tears no longer, but kings and princes now at the right hand of the throne of the God you served so faithfully when on the earth—gather yourselves, immortal and awful shades, around us, and witness, not the useless honors we pay to your memories, but our resolves of fidelity to truth, duty and freedom, which arise out of the contemplation of the beneficent operation of your own great principle of conduct, and the ever-widening influence of your holy teachings and Godlike example.

After the preceding oration had been pronounced the company sat down to a public dinner,[1] at which the following toast was proposed:

The Orator of the Day—Eloquent in his tribute to the virtues of the Pilgrims; faithful, in his life, to the lessons they taught.

Mr. Seward spoke in response substantially as follows:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Puritans were Protestants, but they were not protestants against everybody and everything, right or wrong. They did not protest indiscriminately against everything they found in England. On the

1 See Memoir, *ante* page 36.

other hand, as we have abundant indications in the works of genius and art which they left behind them, they had a reverence for all that is good and true; while they protested against everything that was false and vicious. They had a reverence for the good taste and the literature, science, eloquence and poetry of England, and so I trust it is with their successors in this once bleak and inhospitable, but now rich and prosperous land. They could appreciate poetry, as well as good sense and good taste, and so I call to your recollection the language of a poet, who had not loomed up at the time of the Puritans as he has since. It was addressed to his steed, after an ill-starred journey from London to Islington town. The poet said:

> "'Twas for your pleasure you came here,
> You shall go back for mine."

Being a candid and frank man, as one ought to be who addresses the descendants of the Puritans, I may say that it was not at all for your pleasure that I came here. Though I may go back to gratify you, yet I came here for my own purposes. The time has passed away when I could make a distant journey from a mild climate to a cold, though fair region, without inconvenience; but there was one wish, I might almost say there was only one wish of my heart that I was anxious should be gratified. I had been favored with many occasions to see the seats of empire in this western world, and had never omitted occasions to see where the seats of empire were planted, and how they prospered. I had visited the capital of my own and of many other American states. I had regarded with admiration the capital of this great republic, in whose destinies, in common with you all, I feel an interest which can never die. I had seen the capitals of the British empire, and of many foreign empires, and had endeavored to study for myself the principles which have prevailed in the foundation of states and empires. With that view I had beheld a city standing where a migration from the Netherlands planted an empire on the bay of New York, at Manhattan, or perhaps more properly at Fort Orange. They sought to plant a commercial empire, and they did not fail; but in New York now, although they celebrate the memories and virtues of fatherland, there is no day dedicated to the colonization of New York by the original settlers, the immigrants from Holland. I have visited Wilmington, on Christina creek, in Delaware, where a colony was planted by the Swedes, about the time of the settlement of Plymouth, and though the old church built by the colonists still stands there, I learned that there did not remain in the whole state a family capable of speaking the language, or conscious of bearing the name of one of the thirty-one original colonists.

I have stood on the spot where a treaty was made by William Penn with the aborigines of Pennsylvania, where a seat of empire was established by him, and although the statue of the good man stands in public places, and his memory remains in the minds of men, yet there is no day set apart for the recollection of the time and occasion when civil and religious liberty were planted in that state. I went still further south, and descending the James river, sought the first colony of Virginia at Jamestown. There remains nothing but the broken, ruined tower of a poor church built of brick, in which Pocahontas was married, and over the ruins of which the ivy now creeps. Not a human being, bond or free, is to be seen within the circumference of a mile from the spot, nor a town or city as numerously populated as Plymouth, on the whole shores of the broad, beautiful,

majestic river, between Richmond at the head, and Norfolk, where arms and the government have established fortifications. Nowhere else in America, then, was there left a remembrance by the descendants of the founders of colonies, of the virtues, the sufferings, the bravery, the fidelity to truth and freedom of their ancestors; and more painful still, nowhere in Europe can be found an acknowledgment or even a memory of these colonists. In Holland, in Spain, in Great Britain, in France, nowhere is there to be found any remembrance of the men they sent out to plant liberty on this continent. So on the way to the Mississippi, I saw where De Soto planted the standard of Spain, and in imagination at least, I followed the march of Cortez in Mexico, and Pizarro in Peru; but their memory has gone out. Civil liberty perishes, and religious liberty was never known in South America, nor does Spain, any more than other lands, retain the memory of the apostles she sent out to convert the new world to a purer faith, and raise the hopes of mankind for the well being of the future.

There was one only place, where a company of outcasts, men despised, contemned, reproached as malcontents, and fanatics, had planted a colony, and that colony had grown and flourished; and there had never been a day since it was planted, that the very town, and shore and coast, where it was planted had not grown and spread in population, wealth, prosperity and happiness, richer and stronger continually. It had not only grown and flourished like a vigorous tree, rejoicing in its own strength, but had sent out offshoots in all directions. Everywhere the descendants of these colonists were found engaged in the struggles for civil and religious liberty, and the rights of man. I had found them by my side, the champions of humanity, upon whose stalwart arms I might safely rely.

I came here, then, because the occasion offered, and if I pretermitted this, it might be the last, and I was unwilling that any friend or any child, who might lean upon me, who reckoned upon my counsel or advice, should know that I had been such a truant to the cause of religious liberty and humanity, as never to have seen the Rock of Plymouth.

My mission being now accomplished, having shed tears in the first church of the Puritans, when the heartfelt benediction was pronounced over my unworthy head by that venerable pastor, I have only to ask that I be dismissed from further service with your kind wishes. I will hold the occasion ever dear to my remembrance, for it is here I have found the solution of the great political problem. Like Archimedes, I have found the fulcrum by whose aid I may move the world —the moral world—and that fulcrum is Plymouth Rock.

DE WITT CLINTON.[1]

De Witt Clinton, son of James Clinton and Mary De Witt, was born at Little Britain, New Windsor, Orange county, in the colony of New York, on the second day of March, 1769. His descent on the father's side was from English ancestors long domiciled in Ireland, and on the mother's side was of French extraction, through a sojourn of the family of some duration in Holland. While yet young, he intermarried with Maria Franklin, who brought him a liberal fortune, and who died in 1818. In the succeeding year he was married to Catharine Jones, who survived him. He had a commanding stature, highly intellectual features, and a graceful form, set off with severe and dignified manners. He combined, in a rare degree, vigor, versatility and comprehensiveness of mind with untiring perseverance in the exercise of a lofty and unconcealed ambition. His ancestors, so far as they are known to us, were brave, cultivated and enterprising men. His father, General James Clinton, and his uncle, Governor George Clinton, mingled in their respective characters the opposite elements of civil conduct and military command, and throughout the American Revolution the latter was the chief popular figure of the state of New York. De Witt Clinton's education, begun in a grammar school near his home, continued at the academy in Kingston, Ulster county, and completed at Columbia College, in the city of New York, was conducted with great care by very learned preceptors. He bore away the college honors in 1786, and immediately engaged in the study of the law under the instruction of Samuel Jones in the city of New York. He was admitted to the bar in 1788. Political affairs at that time absorbed the public attention. The city of New York, a second rate mercantile and practically a provincial town, already felt, though it did not understand, the social impulses which were to push it forward so soon to become the capital city of America. The state of New York, a third rate political

1 A portion of this biography appears in the *New American Cyclopedia*.

power, with a population confined to the shores of its few and short navigable rivers, undistinguished by either culture or enterprise, and embarrassed by African slavery, was undergoing the necessary preparation for that struggle with the moral and physical resistances which was at no distant day to be crowned with its inauguration as the leading state in the new Federal Union. The United States had achieved legal independence of Great Britain, and were perplexed with the responsibility of adopting an untried and purely experimental structure of government under which to contest by legislation, by diplomacy, and even by war, for that real commercial independence and that practical political independence which the European states pertinaciously refused to them. Until that time the several states had been supreme, and their statesmen had exercised control, while the confederation was subordinate and its agents powerless. Centralization was now to begin, and ultimately was to reverse these relations. The new federal government was to enter the states, modifying the action of the respective forces, and they were to struggle as they might for the maintenance and preservation of reserved rights of sovereignty which were indispensable. The equality and sovereignty of the people were now newly and practically established, and the arena of public service open to all competitors. George Clinton differed from Hamilton, Jay and Schuyler concerning the merits of the federal constitution, and gave to its adoption only a reluctant and distrustful support. The temper of the time was uncharitable. His confessed integrity, heroic services and practical wisdom, were held by the friends of the new system insufficient to excuse this error, nor could he on his part accord his confidence to those of his compatriots who he thought were rashly subverting necessary foundations of public liberty. Holding the office of governor, which then was a station of the greatest dignity and influence, he became at once the head of the republican or anti-federal party within the state, and was immediately engaged in a contest which involved all the stakes of a generous and noble ambition. Numbers were on his side, but talents and the influences which favored the new federal government were against him. De Witt Clinton's ardent temper and earnest ambition carried him at once into the political field, and his sentiments, sympathies and affections determined his position under the banner of his kinsman, the chief within the state of the republican party. While the question of the adoption of the

federal constitution was yet a subject of popular discussion, he proved his zeal and controversial power by writing a series of letters signed "A Countryman," in reply to the celebrated letters of the "Federalist." He attended the state convention which adopted the constitution and reported its interesting debates for the press, and forsaking his profession at once and forever, he became the private secretary of George Clinton, the governor of New York. In this position he maintained the cause of his kinsman, and that of the republic, by such a vigorous use of the press that he immediately came to be regarded as its leading and most prominent champion. Thus early, he established that character of a partisan politician which he maintained ever afterward. But the official position which he held, though humble, afforded him an opportunity to devote himself to measures and policies important to the public safety and welfare, and the spirit with which he engaged in duties of that kind procured for him two other appointments, one of secretary of the newly organized board of regents of the university, and the other of secretary of the board of commissioners of fortifications of the state. So it happened, that he laid in the beginning of his public life the foundations of that superstructure of useful service which constitutes the enduring monument of his fame.

George Clinton was continued in the office of governor by repeated elections; but the federal party continually gained ground, and in 1792 a decided majority of votes were cast for John Jay, its candidate for that office. The returns, however, were held defective in form, and the credentials were given once more to George Clinton. It was manifest, in 1795, that the federalists must prevail. George Clinton voluntarily retired, and Mr. Jay was chosen his successor. De Witt Clinton relinquished his offices, but did not relax his championship of the republican cause, in opposition to the administration of Mr. Jay in the state, and to the administration of John Adams at Washington. His opponents insisted then, as they did ever afterward, that he conducted political controversies with rancor and bitterness. Doubtlessly his language was often vehement and criminatory, and an aggressive personality marks his papers, which, if used at this day, would be universally condemned, and would detract from an otherwise just effect. But Junius was the model adopted by nearly all political writers at that period, and scarcely any controversy was conducted, on either political or eccle

siastical questions, without the mutual use of unsparing invectives. We can, therefore, judge but very imperfectly of the relative demerits of Mr. Clinton in this respect. With all his vehemence of partizan feelings, however, he nevertheless adhered to the line of patriotic conduct he had so early marked out for himself. Thus, while assailing the administration of Mr. Adams and the federalists for their alleged hostility toward France, he raised, equipped, commanded and disciplined an artillery company, which was held in readiness for the defense of the country in the event of the occurrence of war then so generally anticipated. Besides these occupations, he applied himself diligently to the studies of natural philosophy, natural history and other sciences. His adversaries were accustomed, then and afterward, to disparage his acquisitions as superficial and pretentious; but a candid examination of his writings will induce us to concede, what then was claimed by his friends, that his proficiency was such as to qualify him for the chair of a professor in many departments of academic knowledge. Truly learned men always cheerfully conceded to him distinguished merit.

The republican party grew rapidly in the state and in the country, under the embarrassed and unpopular administration of John Adams. Mr. Clinton was sent to the assembly, the lower house of the legislature of New York, by the city of New York, in 1797, and in the next year he was chosen by the electors of the southern district to represent them in the senate of the state for a term of four years. The republican party triumphing in the Union in 1800, carried also a majority in the state of New York, although John Jay still remained in office. Official patronage in the state was by its first constitution committed to the governor, together with a council consisting of one senator from each district, chosen by a vote of the house of assembly. The governor presided in the council, and habitually exercised exclusively the right of nomination, leaving only to the council the power to confirm or reject. During the administration of George Clinton, his opponents, when in a majority in the council, had claimed for each member a right of nomination coördinate with that of the governor; but the pretension was disallowed by governor Clinton, and the original practice remained. De Witt Clinton, in 1801, became a member of the council, backed by a republican majority. He now challenged the right of nomination for himself and his associates. The governor denied it, and

adjourned the council, and never afterward reconvened it. He submitted the subject to the legislature, and appealed to that body for a declaratory law. Mr. Clinton vigorously defended the position assumed by him in the council. The legislature referred the matter to a convention of the people. The republican party predominated in that body, and the constitution was amended so as to effect the object at which Mr. Clinton had aimed. It can hardly be denied that on the question of construction of the constitution, as it originally stood, the position of Mr. Clinton was untenable. Experience proved that the innovation was unwise. The spirit of party had now become intense. It must be believed, in charity to both parties, that each sincerely, though erroneously, doubted the loyalty of the other to institutions yet new, and to a form of government the ultimate stability of which was still deemed uncertain. Proscription was a natural result of this diseased condition of the public mind. It broke forth suddenly, and became violent and undiscriminating. Thenceforth every change of public opinion in the state was followed by removal of all public officers not protected by the constitution and laws. The temper of political debate became more than ever acrimonious. Cupidity and ambition became bold and exacting. Parties divided into personal factions, and then again centered into new and disquieting forms of recombination. It was then that the names of factions and parties became confused and unmeaning; the politics of the state became a mystery to observers beyond its limits, and acquired proverbially the characteristics of intrigue and violence.

Perhaps it is true that De Witt Clinton was justly responsible, in a considerable degree, for the inauguration of this reign of license, as his opponents always contended. But, if we judge the parties and the men of that day by the test of general principles, or even if we allow them the consideration of the characters which they ultimately maintained, we must conclude that the faults and errors which thus brought reproach upon them all was found exclusively on the side of no individual, nor of any one party or faction, but were, in some sense, incidents of the times and of a peculiar stage of republican society. However this may be, it is certain that Mr. Clinton, at the same time, acted, well and nobly, a higher and more patriotic part, aside from the partisan transactions in which he was thus engaged. It was a season of apprehended invasion. He was active and efficient in securing the means of public defense. The public

health was continually threatened by the approach of contagious pestilence. He was unremitting and judicious in providing the necessary sanitary laws and institutions. He urged improvements of the laws favorable to agriculture, manufactures, and the arts; labored to stimulate the great and finally successful efforts of the time to bring steam into use as an agent of navigation; and employed all his talents and influence in meliorating the evils of imprisonment for debt, and in abolishing slavery. At the very early age of thirty-three, his term of brilliant service in the senate of the state was crowned by his appointment to a seat in the senate of the United States. He remained in that body throughout two of its annual sessions. The period, though short, sufficed to enable him to impress upon the country a conviction of his great ability, and to augment as well as enlarge the sphere of his already eminent reputation. His principal achievement there was an elaborate, exhaustive and impressive speech in favor of moderation on the occasion of a high popular excitement against Spain, resulting from her violation of treaty stipulations for commercial privileges to the citizens of the United States on the banks of the Mississippi—the territory of Louisiana not yet having been acquired by the United States.

Mr. Clinton resigned his place in the senate of the United States, to assume the office of mayor of the city of New York, under an appointment made by George Clinton and a republican council of appointment in 1803—that distinguished man having now again been elevated to the office of governor of the state. The mayoralty was attractive to Mr. Clinton, because, under the charter of the city, the powers and duties belonging to it were manifold; its responsibilities, in that period of perplexity in the foreign relations of the country, were great, its patronage not inconsiderable, and its emoluments large. Nor is it to be doubted that, in the confused condition of the domestic politics of the state, when rivalries, dangerous to his distinguished kinsman and himself, were manifesting themselves in many ways, it was thought important that he should be at home to defend and protect personal interests thus exposed. Nevertheless, it was a misfortune to Mr. Clinton to break up a relation so grave as that of a senator in congress to his constituency, so suddenly, and upon considerations of personal advantage. Nor can it be doubted now, that, having regard to merely individual interests, the change thus made, from the higher and more distant national theatre to the lower and nearer municipal one, filled

as it was with angry and jealous contentions, was a great error. He held the mayoralty by the precarious tenure of appointment, liable to removal with every revolution of the political wheel within the state. He remained undisturbed in it from 1803 until 1807, when he was removed. He was reäppointed in 1809; was displaced in 1810; was restored in 1811; and thenceforward continued therein until 1815. Within this period of nearly twelve years, Mr. Clinton was also a member of the senate of the state from 1805 until 1811, and was lieutenant-governor from 1811 to 1813, and during a portion of that time also held a seat in the council of appointment. These changes of office worked no change in his character, and were attended by no divergence on his part from his line of conduct already sharply defined.

George Clinton, who had been known as an aspirant to the presidency for many years, was elected vice-president of the United States in 1804, and soon thereafter, by reason of his advanced years, ceased to be conspicuous. De Witt Clinton, by an easy transition, rose to the same eminent consideration which his kinsman had held, and came to be regarded as the foremost candidate of the republican party within the state of New York for the office which bounds the range of ambition in our country. Not at all abating either his personal activity or his proscriptive severity toward others, he encountered at their hands hostility and retaliation, fierce, violent and apparently relentless. A dangerous rival disappeared when Aaron Burr sank under the suspicion of intrigues against Mr. Jefferson in the election of 1800, and the reproaches of malice aforethought in the duel in which the honored Hamilton had fallen by his hand in 1804; but Mr. Clinton was successively brought into an attitude of distrust toward Lewis and Tompkins, the successors of George Clinton in the office of governor. He was all the time obnoxious to the federal administration at Washington, because first the ambition of his uncle, George Clinton, and then his own, were inconvenient to the Virginia presidents, Jefferson and Madison. He, however, hesitated at first, and probably on considerations of a public nature, to approve the system of commercial restrictions adopted by the former, as he questioned, perhaps not unjustly, the wisdom of the course of the latter in the trying hour which preceded the declaration of war against Great Britain, while no real provision had as yet been made for the public defense, much less any adequate means prepared for

aggression. It is beyond all doubt now, that Mr. Clinton was eminently brave, and that he loved his country with a devotion that knew no hesitation when her safety or welfare required sacrifice at his hands. Indeed, in every period of anxiety, and at every stage of the long controversy between the United States and the great powers of western Europe, he was vigorous, untiring and bold, and having due regard to the opportunities for efficiency which his position afforded, he was as effective as any other patriot in the public service. But there was at that time a portion of the federal party which condemned the measures of the government so severely that their own loyalty to the country was not unnaturally questioned, and their conduct, whatever was their motive, had a tendency to encourage the public enemy, and so to embarrass the administration in a crisis when it had a right to demand the energetic support of all parties. This misconduct brought suspicion on the whole federal party, although, as a mass, it was loyal and patriotic, and it suited the purposes of Mr. Clinton's opponents to impute his hesitation and reserve manifested on the occasions which have been mentioned, to the influence of sympathies with the misguided federalists, which were forbidden equally by his relations to the republican party and a just sense of the real danger of the country. Day by day, therefore, old republican associates and followers separated from him, and in their places federalists, who saw that there was no longer any hope of effectually serving their country under their own dilapidated organization, and who believed him as patriotic as the statesmen who were in power, and much wiser than they, lent him indirectly their sympathy and cautious support. It was in this unlucky conjuncture that Mr. Clinton, whose aspirations to the presidency of the United States had long been known, concluded that the time had arrived when they ought to be and could be realized. Mr. Madison's first term was to expire in 1813, and his successor was to be elected in 1812. The republican caucus at Washington, which then was the recognized nominating body, disallowed Mr. Clinton's pretensions, and renominated Mr. Madison. Mr. Clinton still retained the confidence of the republican party in his own state as an organized political force, though it was sadly demoralized. He received a nomination at the hands of the republican members of the legislature. The federalists made no nomination, and indirectly gave him their support. He received eighty-nine electoral votes, while Mr. Madison took one

hundred and twenty-eight votes, and thus was reëlected. This defeat was disastrous to Mr. Clinton. The war which, pending the canvass, had been declared against Great Britain, was deemed a republican measure, and its successful issue was of vital importance to the country. Mr. Clinton's attitude was regarded as that of an opponent of the war policy, and of course as a sympathizer with the public enemy. The republican party of the state of New York shrunk from his side, and at the first opportunity, in 1813, displaced him from his office of lieutenant-governor, leaving him only the mayoralty of the city of New York, and even this relatively inferior position was soon afterward to be taken away. He seemed not only to have been convicted of betraying his own party when holding a high command in it, to its adversary, in a crisis when its safety was identified with that of the country for his own advantage, but also of being unsuccessful in the treason. But in fact Mr. Clinton had changed not his principles, policies or sympathies, but only his personal relations. He had attempted to gain the presidency, not to overthrow the republican party, but to reëstablish it as he thought on a better foundation; not to favor the public enemy, but to prosecute the war against him, as he thought, with greater vigor and effect; not to betray his country, but to make assurance of her safety doubly sure. He had erred in judgment, and the result was a complexity of relations that seemed to render all further ambition hopeless. He was a republican disowned by his party; and though not a federalist, he was held responsible for all the offenses imputed to them, without having their confidence, or even enjoying their sympathy. His fall seemed irretrievable. Nevertheless, Mr. Clinton had been fortunate during the period which we have been reviewing, in laying broad and deep the foundations of a popularity that, at no distant day, might be made to maintain a personal party, which would long perplex and often confound the adversaries who now exulted over what was thought his final ruin.

The city of New York had now begun to feel the beneficial influence of the centralization of commerce at its wharves, under the operation of the federal constitution, and public spirit was profoundly awakened. The deficiencies of its municipal laws, of its defenses, of its scientific and literary institutions, of its institutions of arts, and the absence of most of the elements of a metropolitan character, were generally felt and confessed. Enlightened, liberal

and active men were moving in a hundred ways to make the city worthy of its high, but newly discovered destiny. Only some high, genial and comprehensive mind was wanted to give steadiness and direction to these noble movements. De Witt Clinton supplied this want. He associated himself on equal terms with other citizens who engaged in the establishment of schools, designed to afford the advantages of universal primary education; with others who founded institutions for the study of history, for improvement in art, for melioration of criminal laws, for the encouragement of agriculture, for the establishment of manufactures, for the relief of all the forms of suffering so fearfully developed in a state of high civilization, for the correction of vice, for the improvement of morals, and for the advancement of religion. In all these associations he subjugated his ambition, and seemed not a leader but a follower of those who by their exclusive devotion were entitled to precedence. They derived from him, however, not only liberal contributions by his pen, by his speech and from his purse; but also the aids of his already wide and potential influence, and the sanctions of his official station and character. He carried the same liberal and humane spirit into his administration as chief magistrate of the city. By virtue of that office, he was not only the head of the police, charged with the responsibilities of preserving order and guarding the city from external dangers, but he was at once a member and president of the municipal council, a member and president of the board of health, a member and president of the court of common pleas, and a member and president of the criminal court. He appeared in all these various characters always firm, dignified, intelligent and prepared in every exigency, the friend of the poor, the defender of the exile, the guardian of the public health, the scourge of disorder, the avenger of crime, the advocate of civil and religious liberty, and the patron of knowledge and virtue. As a member of the senate of the state and lieutenant-governor he exercised the functions not only of a legislator, but also of a judge of the court of *dernier resort*, and amid all the intrigues and distractions of party he bore himself in those high places with the dignity and exercised the spirit of a sagacious, far-seeing, and benevolent statesman.

He not only favored, but led in correcting abuses, reforming errors, simplifying and meliorating laws, laying the foundation of universal education, and of enduring systems of public charity, and

removing as fast as possible the yet lingering remains of slavery. Especially, he corrected the popular prejudice against himself in regard to his loyalty, by the utmost liberality and efficiency both as mayor and legislator, in securing adequate means for public defense, by procuring loans to the government, by voting supplies of materials and men, and by soliciting the military command to which his admitted courage, talent and influence seemed to entitle him. But beyond all this he adopted early and supported ably and efficiently the policy of the construction of canals from lake Erie and lake Champlain to the tide water of the Hudson, and showed to his fellow citizens, with what seemed a spirit of prophecy, the benefits which would result from those works to the city, the state and the whole country in regard to defence, to commerce, to increase of wealth and population and to the stability of the Union. He was so successful in this that he was deputed, with others, in the year 1812, by the legislature of the state, to submit that great project to the federal government at Washington, and solicit its adoption or patronage of the policy as a national measure. That government, happily for the state, and fortunately for him, declined, and the occurrence of the war of 1812, with its dangers and exactions, put the subject to rest to be revived at a more propitious season. The intellectual vigor, the impartial spirit, and the energetic resolution which Mr. Clinton displayed in these various duties awakened profound and general admiration, while the manifest beneficence of his system excited enthusiastic desires for material and moral progress throughout the state. He had thus become identified, even in the darkest hour of his political day, with the hopes and ambition of his native state, and with the hopes and ambitions of all the other states which waited to be benefited directly by her movement, or to emulate her example. He had thus won a fame which extended beyond this state, throughout other states, and even reached foreign lands. While sinking out of view as a political character, not only in the Union, but even in the state of New York, De Witt Clinton, the private citizen, was more honored than the chief magistrate of the city; De Witt Clinton, the mayor of New York, eclipsed the chief magistrate of the state; and De Witt Clinton, the state senator, filled a space in the public respect which the chief magistrate of the United States might well envy. By a system chosen and perfected by himself and exclusively his own, he had gained a moral position similar to and equal to that

which Hamilton had won before him when the tide of popular favor having deserted him and left him destitute of power and influence he still stood forth an isolated figure on the canvass, attracting an admiration and exciting an interest which his successful rivals feared to contemplate. But it was not for Mr. Clinton to reäscend the political ladder until he had released his hold on the lowest step and had once more touched the ground. His opponents made haste to dislodge him from that last foothold. In January, 1815, he was removed from the mayoralty by a council of appointment in the interest of the republican party.

Fortune had gone with greatness, and he sunk into private life without even the means of respectable subsistence. The severity of this proscription, coupled with the greatness of his fall and the majesty of his character, awakened regrets and sympathies among large classes, who did not stop to consider how rashly he had tempted fortune, or how ruthlessly he had wielded the ax against those who had now precipitated him to the ground. Peace had now returned, and, with it, the aspirations for civil progress which war had for a short time suppressed. In the autumn of that year, and in the obscurity of a retreat to the country, he prepared an argument in favor of the immediate construction of the Erie and Champlain canals—demonstrating their feasibility, the ability of the state to construct them, their certain reimbursement of the cost, their utility and indispensableness as means of natural defense, and their efficiency in opening the western portions of the state to civilization and culture, and containing a glowing but just exposition of the impulse they would give to the growth of the city of New York and to the aggrandizement of the state, as well as the advantages which that immense extension of the internal navigation of the country would confer on the whole nation, by leading to a development of its yet unproductive resources, and by cementing the bonds of the American Union. Never has there appeared, in this or perhaps any other country, a state paper, at once so vigorous, so genial, so comprehensive, and so conclusive. It was couched in the form of a memorial from the citizens of New York to the legislature of the state, and was deferentially submitted to a public meeting for their adoption. As yet, nations and communities, by the action of the people, had only sought aggrandizement by wars and conquests. The people of this country had had some experience of this system of aggrandizement, and were heartily tired of it. But

the enterprise of material improvement was new to them, and full of benignant promise. If dangers attended it, they were unforeseen and unconceived. The stroke was electrical. The city adopted the memorial, and appealed to the citizens of the interior portions of the state. They responded with enthusiasm. Other states and territories, expecting either direct benefit, or waiting only to follow the lead of a power so respectable as New York in similar enterprises, lent their approving and encouraging voices. The policy was, from that moment, certain of success. It was hindered only by the political prejudices which hung around its advocate. His opponents called these prejudices into new activity. With short-sighted malice, they affected to consider the attractive scheme as not merely a new resort of a ruined politician, but as one original with and devised by himself—impracticable, absurd, and visionary—although, for more than a hundred years, sagacious and enlightened statesmen, connected with the affairs of the colony and of the state of New York, had, with various degrees of distinctness, indicated and commended the obnoxious policy, and the state itself had, at an early day, made demonstrations toward its adoption by improving some parts of its natural channels, and had recommended the whole enterprise, before the war, to the adoption of the federal government. Mr. Clinton, if left to designate for his adversaries their mode of opposition, could have preferred no other. It presented him as not merely the advocate, but even the inventor of the system whose prospective benefits were already triumphantly demonstrated. His personality thus stamped upon it, he must necessarily rise with it into popular favor. Mr. Clinton appeared at Albany, at the assembling of the legislature, to commend it. The governor—the organ of the republican party—was silent on the subject. The republican legislature rendered it just enough of favor to encourage and strengthen Mr. Clinton, and too little to make it their own and separate him as a necessary agent from it. It appointed him, with others, a commissioner to make the required surveys and estimates, solicit grants and donations, and report at the next session.

A vacancy in the office of governor was now to occur by the transfer of the esteemed and popular Tompkins, the chief republican character in the state, to the post of vice-president of the United States at Washington. Who could deny that Mr. Clinton's election to the office of governor would further the adoption of his great

scheme of improvements? Who could deny his claim to that position for the purpose of securing its adoption and conducting its prosecution? Who could deny even that his advancement to that position was absolutely essential to the success of the measure? When the only popular favorite was relinquishing the office and there was no other statesman indicated by any general preference for it, why should it be denied, under the exigent circumstances already mentioned, to Mr. Clinton? Spontaneous demonstrations presented him before the public as a candidate, the party machinery refused to work in the hands of his adversaries and he was elected in the summer of 1816, to the office of governor, practically by the unanimous voice of the people. It seemed, for a short time, as if all partisan organizations had been permanently broken up, and as if party spirit had been extinguished forever. Notwithstanding all these pleasing auguries, the period of his administration was filled up, like former ones, with violent and embittered political controversies, cherished and fomented by jealousies of parties connected with the federal administration at Washington. In all these controversies he was always the subject—desire to advance him at last to the presidency of the United States, irrespective of all existing combinations, constituting the motive of one party; and determination to rebuke and punish what was called his unchastened ambition, the motive of the other. He triumphed in 1819, being reëlected, though by a very small majority, over Daniel D. Tompkins, who, while yet vice-president, became the opposing candidate and brought into the canvass a popularity never before overbalanced. His adversaries availed themselves of just complaints against the constitution to move the call of a convention for its amendment, and the measure was eminently popular. Mr. Clinton, perhaps unnecessarily, and at least unfortunately, hesitated so long as to become identified with the opposition to it. The convention made reforms which diminished the power of the executive and judiciary and conceded an enlargement of the right of suffrage, with other popular rights, while it adopted his canal policy, which had already been auspiciously begun and might now be supposed sure to be carried on to a successful conclusion. Mr. Clinton wisely declined to be a candidate, under such circumstances, for a reëlection as governor under the new constitution, and Joseph C. Yates was called to the office with a unanimity equal to that which had attended Mr. Clinton's elevation to the same place. Faction,

however, disorganized the triumphant party in 1824. At the same time, the legislature in its interest abused its triumph over Mr. Clinton by removing him without notice and without cause from the now obscure office of canal commissioner in which he was serving, as he had served from the first, only as an adviser and without any compensation. Indignation awakened by this injustice and combined with popular discontents, resulting from other causes, bore him at the end of the same year back into the office of governor by a very decided vote; but the new combination which had secured this result was committed to the support of John Quincy Adams, as its head in the federal government, while Mr. Clinton's sympathies or his views of duty or of interest determined his inclination toward, first William H. Crawford, and then Andrew Jackson as candidates for the presidency. He was thus once more in his old position, sustained by a party from whom he withheld his confidence and sympathy, and opposed by the one to which he looked for ultimate support. He was barely reëlected in 1826, while the legislature was opposed to his policy and interests.

His administration of the state government, however, which continued throughout a period of twelve years, with the exception of an intervening period of two years, was one of unequaled dignity and energy, devoted to just and necessary reforms and to the great enterprises of moral and social improvement. He had the good fortune to mature the system of finance which enabled the state, unconscious of expense or care, to begin and carry out his policy of internal improvement, and to break with his own hand the ground in the beginning of the enterprise on the fourth of July, 1817; and overcoming constant, unremitting and factious resistances, he had the felicity of being borne, in October, 1825, in a barge on the artificial river that he seemed, to all, to have constructed, from lake Erie to the bay of New York, while bells were rung and cannons saluted him at every stage of that imposing progress. No sooner had that great work been undertaken in 1817, than the population of the state began to swell with augmentation from other states and from abroad, prosperity became universal, old towns and cities expanded, new ones rose and multiplied. Agriculture, manufacture and commerce, the three great wheels of national industry, were quickened in their movement, and wealth flowed in upon the state from all directions. He inaugurated the construction of branches of the Erie canal, by which it was

ultimately connected with the internal lakes, with Lake Ontario and with the Susquehanna, the Allegany and the St. Lawrence rivers, and by his counsel and advice, now sought in all directions, he hastened the opening of those canals in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, which in connection with those of New York and with natural channels now constitute a system adequate to the internal commerce of an empire, and is interrupted only by mountains which defy the prowess of man.

De Witt Clinton, witnessing the enjoyment of the continually enlarging realization by the public of the benefits of his labors and in the midst of growing popular perplexities concerning the balanced probabilities of his yet rising to the highest honors of his country, or of his sinking once more and irretrievably beneath the heel of domestic faction, died at Albany, the seat of his authority and the chief theatre of his active life, on the 11th day of February, 1828. Need it be added that party spirit was hushed into profound silence, that the legislature provided for his family, bereft as they were of parent and of fortune, that a grateful people celebrated his departure from the earth with all the pomp of national sorrow, and that posterity, already advancing on the stage, hails his shade with the homage deserved by a benefactor of mankind. The course of human nature in similar cases and circumstances is always the same.

Note.—In 1839, and again in 1841, Governor Seward, in his annual messages to the legislature, recommended the erection of a monument, by the state, to the memory of De Witt Clinton, and at the same time paid an eloquent tribute to his character and distinguished public services. Mr. Seward's "Notes on New York," also, contain several allusions to Mr. Clinton in the history of the canals and other great enterprises of the state. *See Volume* II., pp. 87, 210, 296, &c.

POLITICAL SPEECHES.

POLITICAL SPEECHES.

THE ADVENT OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

ALBANY, OCTOBER 12, 1855.

HAIL to the capital of New York! Venerable for its antiquity, and yet distinguished for its loyalty to progress, liberty and union. This capital is dear to me. It has more than once sent me abroad with honorable functions, and even in those adverse seasons which have happened to me, as they must happen to all representative men, it has never failed to receive me at home again with sympathy and kindness. Doubly honored be the banner of the stars and stripes, which here takes on its highest significance, as it waves over the halls where equal representatives make the laws which regulate the lives of equal freemen. Honored be Justice, whose statue surmounts the dome above us! Blind, that she may not, through either passion or prejudice, discriminate between the rich and the poor, the Protestant and Catholic, the native born and the exotic, the freeman and him whose liberties have been cloven down, and weighing with exact balance the rights of all classes and all races of men. Old familiar echoes greet my ear from beneath these embowered roofs! The voices of the Spencers, of Kent, and Van Rensselaer, and Van Vechten, of the genial Tompkins, of Clinton the great, and the elder Clinton, of King and Hamilton, of Jay, the pure and benevolent, and Schuyler, the gallant and inflexible. The very air that lingers around these arches, breathes inspirations of moral, social, of physical enterprise, and of unconquerable freedom.

You, old, tried, familiar friends, ask my counsel whether to cling yet longer to traditional controversies and to dissolving parties, or

to rise at once to nobler aims, with new and more energetic associations! I do not wonder at your suspense, nor do I censure caution or even timidity. Fickleness in political associations is a weakness, and precipitancy in public action is a crime. Considered by itself, it is unfortunate to be obliged to separate from an old party and to institute a new one. The new one may exhibit more enthusiasm for a time, but it must also for a time lack cohesion and discipline. The names of parties are generally arbitrary, and not at all indicative of their characters or purposes. A generous man will, nevertheless, cling, as if it were a family altar, to a name that has long been a rallying cry for himself and his compatriots.

The great question before us, however, is to be decided, not by feeling, but under the counsels of reason and patriotism. It was the last injunction given by the last one of the revolutionary congresses to the American people, never to forget that the cause of America had always been, and that it must ever continue to be, the cause of human nature. The question then, is, what is the course dictated to us by our love of country and of humanity?

The nation was founded on the simple and practically new principle of the equal and inalienable rights of all men, and therefore it necessarily became a republic. Other governments, founded on the ancient principle of the inequality of men, are, by force of an equal necessity, monarchies or aristocracies. Whenever either of these kinds of government loses by lapse of time and change of circumstances its elementary principle, whether of equality or inequality, thenceforward it takes a rapid and irresistible course toward a reörganization of the opposite kind. No one, here or elsewhere, is so disloyal to his country or to mankind, as to be willing to see our republican system fail. All agree that in every case, and throughout all hazards, aristocracy must be abhorred and avoided, and republican institutions must be defended and preserved.

Think it not strange or extravagant when I say that an aristocracy has already arisen here, and that it is already undermining the republic. An aristocracy could not arise in any country where there was no privileged class, and no special foundation on which such a class could permanently stand. On the contrary, every state, however republican its constitution may be, is sure to become an aristocracy, sooner or later, if it has a privileged class standing firmly on an enduring special foundation; and if that class is continually

growing stronger and stronger, and the unprivileged classes are continually growing weaker and weaker. It is not at all essential to a privileged class that it rest on feudal tenures, or on military command, or on ecclesiastical authority, or that its rights be hereditary, or even that it be distinguished by titles of honor. It may be even the more insidious and more dangerous for lacking all these things, because it will be less obnoxious to popular hostility.

A privileged class has existed in this country from an early period of its settlement. Slaveholders constitute that class. They have a special foundation on which to stand—namely, personal dominion over slaves. Conscience and sound policy forbid all men alike from holding slaves, but some citizens disregard the injunction. Some of the states enforce the inhibition; other states neglect or refuse to enforce it. In all of the states there are but three hundred and fifty thousand citizens who avail themselves of this peculiar indulgence; and those, protected by the laws of their states, constitute a privileged class. They confess themselves to be such a class, when they designate the system of slavery as a "peculiar" institution.

The spirit of the revolutionary age was adverse to that privileged class. America and Europe were firmly engaged then in prosecuting what was expected to be a speedy, complete and universal abolition of African slavery. Nearly all of the privileged class admitted that slavery, as a permanent system, was indefensible, and favored its removal. They asked only, what seemed by no means unreasonable, some securities against a sudden, rash and violent removal of the evil. Under these circumstances, even the most decided opponents of slavery consented to some provisions of the federal constitution which were inconsistent with the stern logic of equality that pervaded all its other parts, and pervaded the whole of the Declaration of American Independence, on which the constitution itself was based. We are not to censure the fathers for these concessions; they had a union of the states to create, and to their ardent and generous minds the voluntary removal of slavery, by the action of the several states themselves, without federal interference, seemed not only certain, but close at hand.

These provisions of the constitution were:

First: That the foreign slave trade should not be abolished before 1808.

Second: That any law or regulation which any state might establish in favor of freedom, should not impair the legal remedy, then supposed to exist by common law, for the recapture, by legal process, in such state, of fugitives from labor or service, escaping from other states.

Third: That three-fifths of all slaves should be counted, in settling the basis of representation in the several states.

These three concessions, which in themselves seem very limited and almost harmless, are all that the fathers consciously made to the privileged class.

But privileged classes always know well how to improve even any indirect advantages which the constitution or laws of a country afford. Such indirect advantages they acquired from two other provisions of the constitution: 1st. That provision which makes the state authority independent and sovereign in municipal affairs, slavery being understood to be purely municipal in its nature. 2d. That provision which, out of tenderness to the small states, gives them a representation in the senate equal to that of the largest state. Freedom builds great states; slavery multiplies small states, and even dwarfs great ones.

Thus we see that the American slaveholders are a privileged class, standing on a special and permanent foundation, and that they are protected in their advantages by the organic laws.

I might show *à priori* that a privileged class, thus established on an exceptional principle, that is wrong in itself and antagonistic to the fundamental principle of the government, must necessarily be dangerous, if it be suffered to expand and aggrandize itself. But unhappily, we are not left to the necessity of resorting to speculation on that subject. The policy of emancipation was set back in this country during the reaction against revolutionary principles, which necessarily attended the reörganization of government; and it was set back still more effectually by the consternation which followed the disastrous failure of the first republic in France. The privileged class promptly seized the advantages which the constitution afforded, to fortify itself in the federal government. The last federal acts directed against the privileged class were, the abolition of the foreign slave trade after 1808, and the eternal prohibition of slavery in the broad and then unsettled region which extends from the north bank of the Ohio to the eastern shore of the Mississippi.

Even the passage of that ordinance was, by its silence, assumed to imply a right on the part of the privileged class to colonize with slaves the region lying south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi.

Unlooked-for events have lent to the privileged class advantages which have more than counterbalanced the adverse effects of this early national legislation. The invention of the cotton-gin, which easily separates the seed from the fibre, has made cotton an almost exclusive agricultural staple in the states of the privileged class, and an eminent commercial staple of the whole country. The national territory has necessarily been enlarged, from time to time, to accommodate an overgrowing population, and an ever-increasing commerce. Favored by these circumstances, the privileged class have at the same time found, in a home production of slaves in Maryland and Virginia, and other states, a compensation for the loss of the African slave trade; and they have not been slothful in unlearning all the fears and dismissing all the timidity and conciliation which marked their conduct during and immediately after the revolutionary war. The admission of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi and Alabama, as slaveholding states, into the Union, seemed unavoidable, inasmuch as they were the overgrowth of some of the old thirteen states; and thus these new states south of the Ohio, balancing the growing free states north of that river, served as a sort of balance between the privileged and the unprivileged classes, which it was not necessary to disturb. This was the first final partition of the unsettled territory of the United States between those classes.

In 1804, France ceded to the United States a broad belt, stretching along the western bank of the Mississippi, from the British possessions on the north, to the Spanish province of Texas on the south. This acquisition, which was equally necessary for the safety of the country and for the uses of commerce, stimulated the desire of the privileged class for an extension of their territory and an aggrandizement of their power. New Orleans, situated practically on the coast of the gulf of Mexico, was already at once an ancient slaveholding colony and an important commercial mart. It lay contiguous to the slaveholding states. Under these circumstances, it was, without any resistance, soon organized and admitted into the Union, with its ancient laws and customs tolerating slavery. St. Louis, though destined to acquire great commercial importance, was as yet an inconsiderable town, with few slaveholders and slaves. The Mis-

sissippi only divided it from the northwest territory, which was already consecrated to freedom. The best interests of the country required, and humanity demanded, that the ordinance of 1787 should be extended across the Mississippi. The privileged class, however, took possession of the region around St. Louis, and made partial settlements lower down on the west bank of the Mississippi. St. Louis and its environs matured as a state in 1819, and demanded admission with slavery into the Union. Then, only thirty-two years after the passage of the ordinance of 1787, and after its unanimous ratification by the American people, the privileged class made common cause with the new slaveholding state, and, assuming a tone at once bold, insolent and menacing, they denied the power of congress, although in the territories it was supreme and exclusive, and equally supreme and exclusive in the admission of new states, to legislate at all against their privileges in the territories, or to refuse admission to a new state, on the ground of its refusal to surrender or abate those privileges; and they threatened in one loud voice to subvert the Union, if Missouri should be rejected. The privileged class were backed then by the Senate of the United States, as they have been backed on all similar occasions since that time. They were met, however, with firmness and decision by the unprivileged class in the house of representatives, and so Missouri failed then to be admitted as a slave state. The privileged class resorted to a new form of strategy—the strategy of compromise. They offered to be satisfied if Missouri only should be admitted as a slave state, while Congress should prohibit slavery forever in all the residue of that part of the Louisiana purchase which lay north of the parallel of 36° 30′ of north latitude—the territory lying between this parallel and the province of Texas, and constituting what is now the state of Arkansas, being left by implication to slavery. This compromise was accepted, and thus diplomacy obtained for the privileged class immediate advantages, which had been denied to their clamor and passion. This compromise, however, could have only the authority of a repealable act of Congress, so far as the prohibition of slavery north of 36° 30′ was concerned. Wise and great men contrived extraordinary forms to bind the faith of the privileged class to that perpetual inhibition. They gave to the compromise the nature and form of a contract, with mutual equivalents between the privileged class and the unprivileged class, which it would be dishonorable and

perfidious on the part of the privileged class, at any time, on any grounds, or under any circumstances, to annul or revoke, or even to draw in question. They proclaimed it to be a contract proper to be submitted to the people themselves, for their ratification, in the popular elections. It was so submitted to the people, and so ratified by them. By virtue of this compromise, Missouri came immediately into the Union as a slave state, and Arkansas followed soon afterward as a slave state, while, with the exception of Missouri, the compromise of 1787, by virtue of the same compromise, was extended across the Mississippi, along the parallel of 36° 30′, to the Rocky mountains. Thus, and with such solemnities, was the strife of the privileged class of slaveholders for aggrandizement of territory finally composed and forever settled.

It is not my purpose to discuss the policy or the justice of that great settlement. As in the case of the constitution, the responsibility for that great measure rests with a generation that has passed away. We have to deal with it only as a fact, and with the state of affairs that was established by it.

The occupation of the new region west of the Mississippi, which had been thus saved for freedom, was artfully postponed indefinitely by dedicating it as a home for the concentrated but perishing Indian tribes. It sounds in favor of the humanity of the unprivileged class, if not of their prudence, that they neither remonstrated nor complained of that dedication.

The success of the privileged class, in securing to themselves immediate possession of Missouri and Arkansas, in exchange for the reversionary interest of the unprivileged class in the remainder of the Louisiana purchase, stimulated them to move for new national purchases of domain, which might yield them further acquisitions. Spain was unable to retain longer the slaveholding provinces of East Florida and West Florida, which lay adjacent to the slave states. They fell to the United States by an easy purchase, and the privileged class with due diligence procured their organization as a state, and its admission into the Union. The spell of territorial aggrandizement had fallen on the United States of America, and simultaneously the spell of dissolution had fallen on the United States of Mexico. The privileged class on our side of the border entered Texas, established slavery there in violation of Mexican laws, detached that territory from Mexico, and organized it as an indepen-

dent sovereign state. Texas, thus independent and sovereign, sought annexation to the United States. In the very hour when the virtue of a sufficient number of the unprivileged classes was giving way to effect a constitutional annexation of Texas, the president of the United States, with a senate not less subservient to the privileged class, executed a *coup d'etat* by which that state unlawfully, and in defiance of all precedent, came into the Union under a covenant stipulating that four new slave states might be created out of its territory and admitted as slave states, while, by a solemn mockery, an inconsiderable fragment that lay north of 36° 30′ was ostentatiously dedicated to freedom. There remained no other new territory within the United States; and so, by this strange partition of Texas, there was a third final settlement of the pretensions of the privileged class; and it was acquiesced in by the unprivileged class, who thought themselves secure in the old northwest territory by the ordinance of 1787, and equally safe in Kansas and Nebraska by the Missouri compromise.

The public repose that followed the annexation of Texas was of short duration. Mexico resented that offense. A war ensued, and terminated in the transfer of the northern portion of Mexico to the United States. The Mexican municipal laws forbade slavery everywhere, and the new possessions were under that law. Not a whit the less, for that reason, did the privileged class demand either an equal partition, or that the whole should be opened to their colonization with slaves. The house of representatives resisted these pretensions, as it had resisted similar ones before; but the senate seconded the privileged class with its accustomed zeal. So congress was divided, and failed to organize civil governments for the newly acquired Mexican territories, and they were left under martial law. The question raised by the privileged class went down to the electors. The people promptly filled the house of representatives with a majority sternly opposed to the extension of slavery the breadth of a single square mile. They increased the force of the unprivileged class in the senate, while they called to the presidency General Taylor, who, although himself a slaveholder, was committed to non-intervention on the question in congress, and to execute faithfully whatever constitutional laws congress should adopt Under these circumstances, California and New Mexico, youthful communities, practically free from slavery, and uncorrupted by the seductions of

the privileged class or its political organs, hastened to establish constitutions, and apply for admission as free states; while the eccentric population of Deseret, indulging latitudinarian principles equally in matters of religion and of politics, prayed to be received into the Union as a state or as a territory, and with or without slavery, as congress should prescribe. The privileged class remonstrated, and a seditious movement was organized in their behalf in the slaveholding states, to overawe congress, if possible, and to inaugurate revolution if their menaces failed. You all know well the way of that memorable controversy. How eminent men yielded to the menaces without waiting for the revolution, and projected and tendered to the privileged class a new compromise, modeled after the already time-honored compromise of 1820. You all know how firmly, notwithstanding this defection of leaders honored and beloved, the house of representatives, and even the senate, repelled the compromise, and how firmly the unprivileged class of freemen throughout the Union demanded the unqualified and unconditional admission of California into the Union, and refused to allot any further territories to the privileged class, for the extension of the system of human bondage. You all remember, too, how in a critical hour the president sickened and died, and how the hearts of congress and of all the people swooned at his grave, and thenceforward all was lost. You remember how the provisional successor of that lamented president with ominous haste accepted the resignation of his cabinet, and committed the seals to a new one, pledged like himself to the adoption of the compromise which the people had condemned; and how at last, after a painful struggle, its adoption was effected. I think, also, that you have not thus soon forgotton the terms of that compromise, the fourth final and everlasting settlement of the conflict between the privileged and the unprivileged classes of this republic. You have not forgotten how the ordinance of 1787, which excluded slavery from the region northwest of the Ohio, was left to stand, as an institution too sacred to be even questioned. How the Missouri compromise, which extended that ordinance across the Mississippi, and over all Kansas and Nebraska, was made at once the authority, precedent, and formula, of the new compromise, and even declared to be an irrepealable law forever. How California, which refused to become a slave state, was grudgingly admitted into the Union as a free one. How the hateful and detest-

able slave auctions were banished from under the eaves of the capitol, quite across to the opposite side of the Potomac river. And how, in consideration of these magnanimous and vast concessions made by the privileged class, it was stipulated that slavery should be continued in the District of Columbia as long as the privileged class should require its continuance. New Mexico, with her free constitution, was superciliously remanded to her native mountains, while, without a hearing, her ancient and free territory was dismembered, and its fairest part transferred to Texas, with the addition of ten millions of dollars, to win its acceptance by that defiant privileged state. You remember how it was solemnly stipulated that Utah and New Mexico, if the slaveholders could corrupt them, should come into the Union, in due time, as slaveholding states; and, finally, how the privileged class, so highly offended and exasperated, were brought to accept this compromise on their part, by a reënactment of the then obsolete fugitive slave law of 1793, with the addition of the revolting features of an attempted suspension of the *habeas corpus;* an absolute prohibition of the trial by jury; an effective repeal of vital rules of procedure and evidence, and the substitution of commissioners in place of courts of justice, in derogation of the constitution. You all remember how laboriously and ostentatiously this compromise was associated with the time-honored forms and solemnities of the Missouri compromise; how it was declared, not the result of mere legislation, but a contract, with mutual equivalents, by the privileged with the unprivileged classes, irrepealable and even unamendable without perfidy and even treason against the constitution and the Union. You all remember how, notwithstanding your protests and mine, it was urgently, violently, clamorously ratified and confirmed, as a full, fair, final, and perpetual adjustment, by the two great political conventions of the country, representing the whole people of the United States, assembled at Baltimore in 1852; and how the heroic and generous Scott was rejected, to bring into the presidency one who might more safely be trusted to defend and preserve and establish it forever.

Nevertheless, scarcely one year had elapsed, before the privileged class, using some of our own representatives as their instruments, broke up not only this compromise of 1850, but even the compromise of 1820 and the ordinance of 1787, and obtained the declaration of congress, that all these settlements, so far as they were adverse to

the privileged class, were unconstitutional usurpations of legislative power. I do not stop to stigmatize or even to characterize these aggressions. Of what use would it be to charge perfidy, when the losses we deplore have resulted from our own imbecility and cowardice? I do not dwell, as others so often and so justly do, upon the atrocious usurpation of the government of Kansas by the slaveholders of Missouri, nor even on the barbarous and tyrannical code which they have established to stifle freedom in that territory, nor even yet on the fraudulent and nefarious connivance of the president with the usurpers.

Nor will I draw into this picture, already too darkly shaded, the personal humiliations which daily come home to yourselves in the conduct of your own affairs. You are commanded by an unconstitutional law of congress to seize and deliver up to the members of that privileged class their fugitive slaves, under the penalty of imprisonment and forfeiture of your estates. You may not interpose between the armed slaveholder and the wounded slave, to prevent his being murdered, without coming under arrest for treason, nor may you cover his naked and lacerated limbs except by stealth. You have fought twenty years, and with but partial success, for the constitutional right to lay your remonstrances on the table of congress. You may not tell the freed slave who reaches your borders that he is free, without being seized by a federal court, and condemned, without a trial or even an accusation, to an imprisonment without bail or mainprize, and without limitation of sentence. Your representatives in either house of congress must speak with bated breath and humble countenance in presence of the representatives of the privileged class, lest justice be denied to your old soldiers when they claim their pensions, or to your laborers when they claim the performance of their contracts with the government. The president of the United States is reduced to the position of a deputy of the privileged class, emptying the treasury and marshaling battalions and ships of war to dragoon you into the execution of the fugitive slave law on the one hand, while he removes governors and judges, at their command, who attempt to maintain lawful and constitutional resistance against them in the territory of Kansas. The vice-president of the United States and the speaker of the house of representatives are safe men, whom the privileged class can trust in every case. The care of the judiciary of the territories, and even

of the foreign relations, is intrusted in either house to assured supporters of that class. Protection is denied to your wool, while it is freely given to the slaveholder's sugar. Millions of acres of the public domain are freely given to Alabama, for railroads, and even as gratuities, while not a dollar can be obtained to remove the rocks of Hellgate and the sands of the Overslaugh, or the bars in lake St. Clair or those in the mouths of your lake harbors. Canada, lying all along your northern borders, must not even be looked upon, lest you may lust after it, while millions upon millions are lavished in war and diplomacy to annex and spread slavery over Louisiana, Florida, Texas, Mexico, Cuba, and Central America. Your liberty of speech, where is it? You may not, without severe rebuke, speak of despotism in foreign lands, lest the slave overhear you on the plantations of the privileged class, or the foreign despot visit them in retaliation for your unavailing sympathy. The national flag, the emblem of universal liberty, covers cargoes of slaves, not only in our own view, but flaunts defiance over them in foreign ports. Judges of United States courts, safe under the protection of the president and the senate, charge grand juries in advance of any question, that obnoxious and unequal federal laws are constitutional and obligatory; they give counsel to legislative bodies how to frame laws which they will sustain, instead of waiting to review those laws when enacted. They even convert the writ of freedom to an engine of slavery, and they pervert the power of punishing irregularities committed in their presence into the machinery of a tyranny as odious as that of the star chamber. The privileged class in Virginia imprison your seamen in their ports, in retaliation for the independence of your executive authorities; and you are already in a doubtful struggle for the right to exclude the traffic in slaves from your own borders.

I will only ask, in concluding this humiliating rehearsal, whether there is not in this favored country a privileged class; whether it does not stand on an enduring foundation; whether it is not growing stronger and stronger, while the unprivileged class grows weaker and weaker; whether its further growth and extent would not be, not merely detrimental, but dangerous; and whether there is any hope to arrest that growth and extension hereafter, if the attempt shall not be made now? The change, that has become at last so necessary, is as easy to be made as it is necessary. The whole number of slaveholders

is only three hundred and fifty thousand, one-hundredth part of the entire population of the country. If you add their parents, children, immediate relatives and dependents, they are two millions—one-fifteenth part of the American people. Slavery is not, and never can be, perpetual. It will be overthrown, either peacefully or lawfully, under this constitution, or it will work the subversion of the constitution, together with its own overthrow. Then the slaveholders would perish in the struggle. The change can now be made without violence, and by the agency of the ballot-box. The temper of the nation is just, liberal, forbearing. It will contribute any money and endure any sacrifices to effect this great and important change; indeed, it is half made already.

The will exists, because the evil has become intolerable, and the need of a remedy is universally acknowledged. What, then, is wanted? Organization! Organization! Nothing but organization.

Shall we organize? Why not? Can we maintain the revolution, so auspiciously begun, without organization? Certainly not. Are you apprehensive of failure, because the revolution is not everywhere and at all times equally successful? Was there ever a revolution that was equally successful at all times and everywhere? Certainly not. Do you say that you cannot abolish slavery in the privileged states? We have no need, no purpose, no constitutional power, no duty, to do so. Providence has devolved that duty on others, and the organic law leaves it wisely to them. We have power to avert the extension of slavery in the territories of the Union, and that is enough. Do you doubt that power? Did not the statesmen of 1787 know the bounds of constitutional power? Somebody has municipal power in the unorganized territories of the Union. Who is it? It is not any foreign state; it is not any of the American states; it is not the people in the territories. It is the congress of the whole United States, and their power there is supreme. Are you afraid that the privileged class will not submit? The privileged class are human, and they are wise. They know just as well how to submit to just authority, firmly and constitutionally exercised, as they do how to extort unequal concessions by terror from timid men. Can the privileged class live without a Union any better than you can? They would not remain and wrangle with you an hour, if they could do so. Can they ever hope to obtain another Union so favorable to them as this one, if this should be overthrown? Will they destroy

themselves, that they may simply do harm to you? Did ever any privileged class commit such an absurd suicide as this? Are you alone the keepers of the Union? Have not the privileged class interests as great to maintain in the Union, and are their obligations to maintain it different from your own?

How shall we organize? The evil is a national one. The power and the influence and the organization of the privileged class pervade all parts of the Union. It knows no north, no south, no east, no west. It is stronger to-day on the bay of San Francisco, surrounded by freemen, than it is on Chesapeake bay, surrounded by slaves. It is not a sectional but a national contest on which we have entered. Our organization, therefore, must be a national one. The means of success are national. We must restore the demoralized virtue of the nation. We must restore the principle of equality among the members of the state—the principle of the sacredness of the absolute and inherent rights of man. We want, then, an organization open to all classes of men, and that excludes none.

We want a bold, out-spoken, free-spoken organization—one that openly proclaims its principles, its purposes, and its objects—in fear of God, and not of man—like that army, which Cromwell led, that established the commonwealth of England. This is the organization we want.

It is best to take an existing organization that answers to these conditions, if we can find one; if we cannot find one such, we must create one. Let us try existing parties by this test. Shall we take the know-nothing party, or the American party, as it now more ambitiously names itself? It is a purely sectional organization. In the privileged states, it scouts the principle of the equality of man, and justifies the unbounded claims of the privileged class. In the unprivileged states, it stifles its voice and suppresses your own free speech, lest it may be overheard beyond the Potomac. In the privileged states, it justifies all the wrongs committed against you. In the unprivileged states, it affects to condemn them, but protests that they shall not be redressed. I speak not now of its false and prevaricating rituals, its unlawful and unchristian oaths, its clandestine councils and its dark conspiracies, its mobs and its murders, proscribing and slaying men for their conscience' sake and for the sake of their nativity. I have spoken of them often enough and freely enough heretofore. I say now only that all these equally unfit this

so-called American party for any national duty, and qualify it to be what it has thus far been—an auxiliary Swiss corps, engaging the friends of freedom in premature skirmishes at one time, and decoying them into ambushes prepared by their enemies at another. Let it pass by.

Shall we unite ourselves to the democratic party? If so, to which section or faction? The hards, who are so stern in defending the aggressions of the privileged class, and in rebuking the administration through whose agency they are committed? or the softs, who protest against these aggressions, while they sustain and invigorate that administration? Shall we suppose the democratic party reünited and consolidated? What is it, then, but the same party which has led in the commission of all those aggressions, save one, and which urged, counseled and coöperated in that, and claims exclusively the political benefits resulting from it? Let the democratic party pass.

Shall we report ourselves to the whig party? Where is it? Gentle shepherd, tell me where! Four years ago it was a strong and vigorous party, honorable for energy, noble achievements, and still more for noble enterprises. In 1852 it was united and consolidated, and moved by panics and fears to emulate the democratic party in its practised subserviency to the privileged class, and it yielded in spite of your remonstrances and mine. The privileged class, who had debauched it, abandoned it, because they knew that it could not vie with its rival in the humiliating service it proffered them; and now there is neither whig party nor whig, south of the Potomac.

How is it in the unprivileged states? Out of New York, the lovers of freedom, disgusted with its prostitution, forsook it, and marched into any and every other organization. We have maintained it here, and in its purity, until the aiders and abettors of the privileged class, in retaliation, have wounded it on all sides, and it is now manifestly no longer able to maintain and carry forward, alone and unaided, the great revolution that it inaugurated. He is unfit for a statesman, although he may be a patriot, who will cling even to an honored and faithful association, when it is reduced so low in strength and numbers as to be entirely ineffectual amid the contests of great parties by which republics are saved. Any party, when reduced so low, must ultimately dwindle and dwarf into a mere faction. Let, then, the whig party pass. It committed a

grievous fault, and grievously hath it answered it. Let it march out of the field, therefore, with all the honors.

The principles of true democrats and the principles of true whigs remain throughout all changes of parties and of men, and, so far as they are sound, they are necessarily the same. Such true democrats and true whigs are now ready to unite on those sound principles common to both. Neither of these two classes can or ought to insist on forcing a defective organization, with a stained banner, upon the other. The republican organization has sagaciously seen this, and magnanimously laid a new, sound and liberal platform, broad enough for both classes to stand upon. Its principles are equal and exact justice; its speech open, decided and frank. Its banner is untorn in former battles, and unsullied by past errors. That is the party for us. I do not know that it will always, or even long, preserve its courage, its moderation, and its consistency. If it shall do so, it will rescue and save the country. If it, too, shall become unfaithful, as all preceding parties have done, it will, without sorrow or regret on my part, perish as they are perishing, and will give place to another, truer and better one.

So long as the republican party shall be firm and faithful to the constitution, the Union, and the rights of man, I shall serve it with the reservation of that personal independence which is my birthright, but, at the same time, with the zeal and devotion that patriotism allows and enjoins. I do not know, and personally I do not greatly care, that it shall work out its great ends this year, or the next, or in my lifetime; because I know that those ends are ultimately sure, and that time and trial are the elements which make all great reformations sure and lasting. I have not thus far lived for personal ends or temporary fame, and I shall not begin so late to live or labor for them. I have hoped that I might leave my country somewhat worthier of a lofty destiny, and the rights of human nature somewhat safer. A reasonable ambition must always be satisfied with sincere and practical endeavors. If, among those who shall come after us, there shall be any curious inquirer who shall fall upon a name so obscure as mine, he shall be obliged to confess that, however unsuccessfully I labored for generous ends, yet that I nevertheless was ever faithful, ever hopeful.

THE CONTEST AND THE CRISIS.

BUFFALO, OCTOBER 19, 1855.

I AM always proud of my native state, when I stand in the presence of the mountains under whose shadow I was born, or on the shores of the silvery lakes among which I dwell. I am prouder still, when, looking off from the vestibule of the capitol, I see the mediterranean waters of the continent, obedient to her command, mingle their floods with the tides of the world-encircling ocean. No less buoyant is my pride now, when, standing here in the presence of Niagara, the marvel of nature itself, I see New York at once unlocking the gates of the west, and standing sentinel on the frontier of the republic, whose safety constitutes the hope of the human race. Speaking on such a stage, how can I do otherwise than speak thoughtfully, sincerely, earnestly?

Ye good men of Erie! The republican party is sounding throughout all our borders a deep-toned alarum for the safety of the constitution, of union, and of liberty. Do you hear it? The republican party declares, that by means of recent treacherous measures adopted by congress and the president of the United States, the constitutional safeguards of citizens, identical with the rights of human nature itself, are undermined, impaired, and in danger of being overthrown. It declares that if those safeguards be not immediately renewed and restored, the government itself, hitherto a fortress of republicanism, will pass into the hands of an insidious aristocracy, and its batteries be turned against the cause which it was reared to defend.

The republican party is not deficient, either in intelligence, in earnest patriotism, in moderation, or in numbers. Its members everywhere are among those who, in all our political, moral and religious associations, have been as enlightened and as efficient as their fellows. Those who constitute its masses have, some for long periods, and others throughout long lives, been consistent supporters, not only of the constitution, but also of all those principles of jus-

tice, equality and liberty, which are the basis of republican government. Not one of them, so far as we know, has ever counseled seditious or factious measures. The republican party holds either paramount or at least respectable rank and authority in thirteen of the states, with either the whole or a majority of the representatives of each of those states in the Federal Union.

It is, indeed, popularly regarded as a party of yesterday. But practically it is old and well known in the field of public affairs. Its policy is to inculcate perpetual jealousy of the increase and extension of slavery, and the plantation organization and admission of free states in the common territories of the United States. This policy is even older than the constitution itself. It was the policy of Jay, Madison, Jefferson and Washington. It was early exercised in prohibiting the African slave trade, and devoting the northwest territory to impartial freedom. Although it has not always prevailed in the federal government, it has, without change or even the shadow of turning, been always the policy of the state of New York, which has continually been the wisest member of the confederacy, and as loyal as any other member. Those who have cherished this policy have, however, been divided and distributed among the many parties which have existed, until, by reason of that separation alone, the policy itself has been arrested and defeated. Defeated, but not successfully repressed, that policy has at last worked out a disintegration of all the parties by whom it was so unwisely and disloyally discarded. Its advocates, thus disengaged and released from diverse and uncongenial relations, have come together by means of a just and natural affinity, and have organized, and they now constitute the republican party.

Slavery, contrary to the expectations of the founders of the republic, still exists in this, the seventy-ninth year of independence; and it has at once a purpose to perpetuate itself, and apparently a reasonable hope of at least a long continuance. On the other hand, the love of equality, springing alike and all at once from the consciences, the judgments, and the hearts of the American people, is irrepressible and imperishable, and so there will remain an undying jealousy of the aggrandizement of slavery. The republican party fosters that jealousy, and directs it to the proper means of active resistance. Thus it happens, that as the republican party is not a party of yes-

terday, it is also not merely a party of to-day, but a durable, perpetual organization.

The slaveholders, always sufficiently united and consolidated, have so improved their advantages, that their aggressions have become at last intolerable. They have rushed into a dead-lock with their opponents. The nation's whole breadth is the field of contest. A changeless sway of the republic, throughout its future existence, is the object of this majestic strife. So the slaveholders on the one side, and the republican party on the other, are now, and for an indefinite period must continue to be, not merely the chief combatants, but practically the only combatants in the Union. Such is the republican party, and such are the circumstances under which it appeals to you to enlist under its banner, and give it your enlightened and effective coöperation. Shall I have on your part a fair and candid hearing in its behalf?

I am well aware that at this moment large popular masses are at rest, while others, broken up in the general wreck of former parties, are moving capriciously, and in divergent directions. I know equally well that popular masses, at rest, have a sort of *vis inertiæ* to overcome; and that popular masses, suddenly and violently disturbed, cannot all at once compose themselves, and organize. I apprehend, therefore, that here, as elsewhere, there may be, on the part of some, a disposition to indolence, and on the part of others a disposition to avoid the organization which seems to me to have become necessary. Both of these dispositions persuade to neutrality.

Are you indeed sure, then, that neutrality will be right, even if you find it possible? Is liberty to be maintained in this republic, otherwise than through the conflicts of great parties? Where there are no great parties, there are either many small factions, or no parties or factions whatever. A state that surrenders itself to the confused contests of small parties or factions, is sinking inevitably toward despotism. A state that has no parties or factions at all is a despotism already.

In every conflict between great parties (speaking without reference to the motives of leaders or of masses), is there not one side that is absolutely or relatively the right side, and which, because it is the right side, is the side favorable to the public welfare and the public safety; and also another side that is absolutely or relatively the wrong side, and therefore the side detrimental to the public welfare,

and injurious to the public safety? Are the welfare and safety of the whole body politic anything else than the welfare and safety of all its individual members? Can I justly expect you to defend my interest, and to assure my safety, if I will not defend and guard them myself? In an ancient republic, it was made a capital crime to refuse to take a side in every political contest that agitated the commonwealth. The penalty was indeed too severe, but was not the policy of the law just and wise? Still you fear agitation, and desire repose. Was not the British commonwealth free from disturbance when it so suddenly went down, and the Stuarts renewed their hateful dominion? Was not the late French republic distracted by petty factions, regardless of the constitution and its safety, when the *coup d'etat* of Louis Napoleon placed him upon the throne, and sent the republicans of France to prison, to exile and to death? Quiet and repose are indeed desirable, when they can be safely enjoyed; but they can be safely enjoyed only when they come at intervals of great activity, and repair and fit the wearied commonwealth for renewed watchfulness.

Can you maintain neutrality? If you enlist into or remain associated with the democratic party, or either of its sections, that is to engage directly in the contest. Even if your party or section disavow opposition to freedom, all its successes enure to the advantage of the slaveholders. Is neutrality easy to be maintained, amid the excitement of political contests? Zealous men in opposing parties mutually respect each other, if they are generous, but they agree in despising the timid and trimming citizen. In every campaign, the place of greatest danger is the neutral ground lying between the two lines, because it is raked by the fire of both armies.

Perhaps you think the immunities of neutrality may be secured by remaining in some independent outside association. How long do you think any considerable mass of American citizens, enlightened, open, manly, ardent, as they are, will be amused or interested in the mummeries of a merely private, secret, selfish, bigoted, proscriptive cabal, and its stale debates about the proper conditions of naturalization, and the claims of adopted citizens to the privilege of gracing the parades of the militia on muster days, and the non-conformity of Catholic clergy to the approved protestant tenures of churches and burying grounds, when the discussion of the great question, whether this shall be a land of freedom or a land of slavery, shall

have actually begun, and every popular tribune is occupied? When the sea is calm, light and fanciful barks sport safely and gaily on its surface, among its merchantmen and its ships of war. But when the storm king lashes the waves, and they rise up to kiss his feet, the fantastical craft, no matter how broad its streamers, or how sharp its keel, or how dexterous its navigator, suddenly disappears.

I conclude, therefore, that you all, if not now, yet soon enough, will take one side or the other in this great controversy.

Which side? It will be the side on which justice, equality and freedom, shall be found; and, therefore, on which final success and triumph shall be found. Which side is that? Even the mathematician cannot prove a self-evident truth in his science; nor can I demonstrate a self-evident truth in politics. To assert that justice, or freedom, may be found on the side of those who are laboring to fortify and extend slavery, is one of those paradoxes which pensioned error requires us to refute. I may be able to illustrate its absurdity. Justice, equality and freedom, in political discussions, relate to individual men and masses of men in the state. The old Roman state consisted of members constituting three classes: 1st. Patricians or privileged citizens; 2d. Plebeians or unprivileged citizens; 3d. Slaves, equally held by both of the other classes. All the politics of that great and powerful people, whether of peace or war, domestic or foreign, turned on the ever-changing balances of these three classes and chiefly on that of the two first. In the United States, there are also three classes. Slaveholders, non-slaveholders and slaves. From the foundation of our system, and even from an early period, in the revolutionary war itself, all American politics, whether of peace or war, and whether domestic or foreign, have mainly turned, as they are now conspicuously turning, with the vibrations of the balances between these three classes, and chiefly those of the balances between the two first. Always the slaveholders, apprehensive of danger to property and pretensions anomalous and obnoxious, seek to fortify themselves, with blind disregard to the rights and interests of non-slaveholders. Always the non-slaveholders, having an increasing consciousness that slavery in any degree is injurious to the state, and dangerous in proportion to its strength, seek to counteract the policy of the slaveholders by diffusing the spirit of freedom. The cause of the non-slaveholders is assumed by the republican party, and by no other party, sect or

faction. On which side, then, may we expect that justice, equality and liberty, will be found?

The opposition, however, tell us they cannot yet see that slaveholders may not possibly have justice on their side. Let us try to make the matter plain. Slaveholders are men engaged in the occupations of society, and they are a power in the state. Non-slaveholders, using only free labor, are human also, and another power in the state. Their systems clash, their interests conflict, their ambitions conflict. The one power strives to extend, the other to circumscribe, slavery. The republicans, by succession, are the party who have opposed all the political concessions which have hitherto been made to slavery. They opposed successfully the introduction of slavery into the northwest territory. They opposed, with partial success, the extension of slavery in the territory acquired from France. They opposed, with partial success, the extension of slavery in the state of Texas. They opposed, with partial success, the extension of slavery in the territory obtained by conquest from Mexico. They opposed the abrogation of the restriction in favor of freedom contained in the Missouri compromise. They now demand the admission, not only of free states, but also of free states only, into the American Union. The slaveholders are the party by whose power and influence all the enlargements of slavery within the United States have been made. On which side, then, are justice, equality and freedom? Answer me upon your honors and your consciences.

An immediate issue involves the question whether Kansas shall be rescued from jeopardy of slavery, aggravated perhaps by the horrors of civil war, and brought into the Union as a free state, notwithstanding the dereliction of congress and the treachery of the president of the United States. This issue is to be decided by the present congress, or possibly continued before the next congress, under a new administration. The republican party are committed to the rescue of Kansas. Is it not just that Kansas shall be a free state? Is it not an inherent right of every community to be free, if it desires to be so? What does your Declaration of Independence mean, if it do not mean that? Was not freedom pledged to Kansas in 1820, by the slaveholders themselves? Was not that pledge surreptitiously and perfidiously broken in 1854, by the Kansas territorial act? Was not freedom pledged even by that act to the people of Kansas, if they should desire to be free? Is not even

that pledge shamefully broken by the usurpation of the Missouri slaveholders? Let the republican party prevail in this and in the next canvass, and Kansas will become a free state. Let the republican party fail, and Kansas will inevitably be a slave state. On which side, then, are justice, equality, and freedom? Answer me, as you will expect to answer at the bar of the public opinion of mankind.

The sophists return to the argument with new and various dilemmas. They are not satisfied that congress had the power to enact the restriction contained in the Missouri compromise of 1820. Grant that they had not. Yet the people of Kansas have the right now to establish a free state. But congress had constitutional power to enact that restriction. It was identical with the ordinance of 1787. That ordinance was established simultaneously with the passing and adoption of the constitution, and successive constitutional congresses have ratified and confirmed it. Did not the statesmen of 1787 understand the constitutional powers of congress?

Again: There is no part of the territory of the United States over which there is not plenary absolute sovereignty residing somewhere? Where does that sovereignty reside? In the people of the United States. By whom is the legislative power of that sovereignty exercised? By congress alone. Congress can make all "needful rules and regulations" concerning the public lands and other property of the United States. The prohibition of slavery was the most needful of all rules and regulations. How pitiful is the quibble built on a criticism of the terms of this grant, when the constitution contains no other grant of legislative power over the territories, and the entire establishment of government in the territories rests on this one grant only!

The opposition tell us, that if congress could prohibit slavery in territories, then they might establish it there; and hence they argue against the power to prohibit. No! Congress can establish slavery nowhere. Slavery was never established rightfully anywhere. Nor was it ever established by law. It is in violation of every line of the Declaration of Independence, and of the whole summary of personal rights contained in the constitution. It is derogatory from the absolute rights of human nature, and no human power can subvert those rights. On which side, then, are justice, equality, and freedom? Answer, as you would have your constitution stand a

charter of freedom, or be perverted to the overthrow of the rights of mankind.

But, granting that justice, freedom, and equality, are on the side of the republican party, we are asked, what guaranties can it give of loyalty to the constitution and the Union? The question is an insult to your state, to the memories of its founders, and the memories of your fathers. Are loyalty and patriotism peculiar virtues of slaveholders only? Are sedition and treason natural vices of men, who, fearing God and loving liberty for themselves, would therefore extend its blessings to all mankind? What is there inherent in the nature of slavery, to make slaveholders loyal to institutions of freedom and equality? What is there inherent in the nature of freedom, to make those who possess, cherish, and defend it, disloyal to its noble and necessary institutions? We give the guaranty of principles identical with the principles of the constitution and the Declaration of Independence. We give the guaranties of peaceful, just, and loyal lives, marked with a patience that has endured as long as they were tolerable, and without even a ruffling of the temper, not only the insults of slaveholders, but their menaces of disunion. Can slaveholders give better guaranties than these? Will they even give you any guaranties of fidelity to the constitution and the Union? No, they argue only in threats of the subversion of both.

The apologists of slavery, thus met, change front suddenly, and ask us whether it is safe to brave these menaces of disunion. I answer—Yes, yes! Interests of a thousand kinds—material, social, moral, and political—affections springing from the very constitution of our nature—bind us non-slaveholders to this Union. The slaveholders, in spite of all these threats, are bound to it by the same bonds, and they are bound to it also by a bond peculiarly their own —that of dependence on it for their own safety. Three millions of slaves are a hostile force constantly in their presence, in their very midst. The servile war is always the most fearful form of war. The world without sympathizes with the servile enemy. Against that war, the American Union is the only defense of the slaveholders—their only protection. If ever they shall, in a season of madness, secede from that Union and provoke that war, they will —— soon come back again.

Nor are these threats the threats of slaveholders themselves. They are arguments of politicians in behalf of the slaveholders. No

man, heated by passion or the spirit of controversy, can safely pledge his future conduct. Reason will decide that for him, when the contemplated emergency shall have come. Neither can these politicians pledge the future conduct of the slaveholders. They will decide for themselves, when the time for their acquiescence comes. No mass of men in this country are so libeled by their enemies as the slaveholders are by their friends. I know many of them well. I have seen them in their homes, on their plantations, and in their social circles. I never knew a disloyal man amongst them. But, even if the case were otherwise, are we always to submit to threats instead of arguments—to refer everything to the umpirage of passion—to surrender everything to those who hold us in duress by our fears? If this is to be the rule, how long shall we have anything valuable, in policy, justice, equality, or freedom, to surrender? I know not how it may affect you, but every nerve and fibre and element of manhood within me is stretched to its utmost tension by these perpetual appeals to the ignoble instinct of fear, and not to the impartial counsel of my conscience and my judgment. Last, comes one who with seeming meekness asks us to consider whether it is wise to jeopard the safety and happiness of twenty-five millions of white men, in a vain effort to mitigate the sufferings of only three millions of negroes? Humane, cautious, paternal, conscientious, man! I might join issue, and ask where, in the ethics either of government or of Christianity, you find authority to hold three millions of men in bondage, to promote the welfare or even to secure the safety of twenty-five millions of other men. But that argument belongs to the abolitionists of slavery, who do not reckon me in their number, and whose objects in this election are far more comprehensive than those of the republican party which I defend.

I leave the rights and the interests of the slaves in the states to their own care and that of their advocates; I simply ask whether the safety and the interests of twenty-five millions of free non-slaveholding white men ought to be sacrificed or put in jeopardy for the convenience or safety of three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders? I hear no answer.

There can be no answer, unless the apologists of slavery shall unblushingly assert that slaveholders, in their intercourse with non-slaveholders, are calm, tolerant, just. How is the fact? The non-slaveholder in the slave state is allowed no independence, no

neutrality. He must support, maintain and defend slavery. The non-slaveholders constitute only a second estate in every slaveholding community; whips, pistols, knives, enforce not merely their silence, but their active partizanship. The right of free speech is lost to them, the right of suffrage is valueless to them, the honors and rewards of public office are denied to them. In Kansas, now by usurpation a slave territory, the utterance of this speech, calm and candid although I mean it to be, would be treason; the reading and circulation of it in print would be punished with death.

Hitherto, this tyranny of slaveholders over non-slaveholding citizens has been mainly confined to slaveholding communities. But slavery has of late arrogantly claimed to be national. Congress is sanctioning the usurpation, and the federal courts and even state courts are boldly enforcing it. In violation of the constitution, congress compels the non-slaveholders in the free states to capture and deliver the fugitive slave. Congress at its last session was on the eve of subverting the original, honored jurisdiction of state courts over federal officers accused of offenses against the personal rights of the citizen. The ancient writ of *habeas corpus* has become a remedy in the capture of slaves, and the process of punishment for contempt suffices to imprison a non-slaveholding citizen, without indictment, trial or conviction, without bail or mainprize, and without limitation of sentence, where a slaveholder is the prosecutor. Are not these invasions of state rights fearfully premonitory that slavery is to become a universally ruling power throughout the republic?

Nevertheless, and in view of all these things, the apologists of slavery ask: Why bring these issues into a merely state election? Who brought them here? What are the platforms of the hards, the softs and the know-nothings, but issues with the republican party, by demurrer or by denial, tendered by themselves? Can you organize a republican national party one year, and dissolve it the next, and yet restore it in a third year, to accommodate local politics? Why have the parties in this state, always competent to control the action of the federal government, left these national grievances to reach this intolerable height? Why should not the legislature, the magistrates, and the ministerial officers, of this state be men who dare to defend, and will defend, the rights of its citizens? Away, then, with these subterfuges.

I dwell briefly on the momentous importance of this crisis. We

are indeed sixteen free states to fifteen slave states, and numerically we have a majority of representatives in both houses of congress. So we had when the Missouri compromise restriction was abrogated. You have no reliable majority in either house, unless you instruct, support and maintain them at home. If you do this, there is an end to the extension of slavery; if you do not, slavery, which is now firmly planted on the coast of Mexico, and which extends upward to the border at Kansas, will cross that border and fasten its outposts on the southern border of British America. Thus the free states will be shut out from the Pacific coast. Divided by this wall, the free states become imbecile, and slavery grasps the dominion of the republic. Dominion over this republic, by whomever exercised, is dominion over the continent and all its islands. Where will freedom, impartial freedom, find a refuge? Will it even find one in British America? Are you willing to be driven to find it there? If it cannot be maintained here, can it be secured there? Shall this be the inglorious end of the republican system planted at Plymouth—this the inglorious end of the republic delivered by Lafayette, organized and consolidated by Washington?

Tell me not that these are exaggerations. Forbear such censures, until you can show me when or where I have sounded a false alarm, or exaggerated any one of the dangers through which, in the course of this long strife with the slaveholders, we have been passing.

I am indeed earnest! I have seen slavery in the slave states, and freedom in the free states; I have even seen both slavery and freedom in this state; I know too well the evils of the former to be willing to spare any effort to prevent their return. The experience of New York tells the whole argument against slavery extension, the whole argument for universal freedom. Suppose that, fifty years ago, New York, like Virginia and Maryland, had clung to slavery, where now would have been these three composite millions of freemen, the choice and flower of Europe and America? In that case, would superstition and false national pride have needed to organize a secret cabal, affiliated by unlawful oaths, to proscribe the exile and his children for their nativity or their conscience' sake? Where would, then, have been the Erie canal, the Genesee Valley canal, the Oswego canal, the Seneca and Cayuga canal, the Crooked Lake canal, the Chemung canal, the Chenango canal, the Black River canal, the Champlain canal—where the imperial New York Central

railroad, the Erie railroad, and the Ogdensburgh railroad, with their branches penetrating not only every inhabited district in this state, but every inhabited region also in adjacent states and in British America? Where would have been the colleges, academies, and above all, the free common schools, yielding instruction to children of all sects and in all languages? Where the asylums and other public charities, and above all, that noble emigrant charity which crowns the state with such distinguished honor? Where these ten thousand churches and cathedrals, renewing on every recurring Sabbath day the marvel of Pentecost, when the sojourner from every land hears the gospel of Christ preached to him in his own tongue? Where would have been the steamers, the barges, brigs and schooners which crowd this harbor of Buffalo, bringing hither the productions of the Mississippi valley and of the gulf coast, in exchange for the fabrics of the Atlantic coast and of Europe, and for the teas and spices of Asia? Where the coasting vessels, the merchant ships, the clippers, the whale ships, and the ocean mail steamers, which are rapidly concentrating in our great seaport the commerce of the world? Where the American navy, at once the representative and champion of the cause of universal republicanism? Where your inventors of steamboats, of electric telegraphs, and of planing machines—where your ingenious artizans—where your artists—where your mighty press? Where your twenty cities—and where, above all, the merry, laughing agricultural industry of native-born and exotic laborers, enlivening the whole broad landscape, from the lake coast to the ocean's side. Go ask Virginia—go ask even noble Maryland, expending as she is a giant's strength in the serpent's coils, to show you her people, canals, railroads, universities, schools, charities, commerce, cities, and cultivated acres. Her silence is your expressive answer.

Once more: Spaniards planted slave states in America; England planted not only slave states but free ones. Spain planted twice as many as England, and cultivated them with more assiduous and maternal care. The Anglo-American free states are all of them strong and vigorous, and already overshadow the continent. Europe regards them with respect and admiration. There is not one Spanish American state that is truly self-subsisting and independent. Sciolists talk of Anglo-Saxon blood. No nobler blood than the Iberian ever coursed through human veins. But the Spaniard planted only slave states. The Anglo-Saxon planted free ones.

THE DOMINANT CLASS IN THE REPUBLIC.

DETROIT, OCTOBER 2, 1856.

THE PROCESS of empire-building in these United States of America is in some respects new and peculiar. We had not here a state which was compact and complete at its beginning, nor have we conquered other nations, or planted colonies, near or distant, to be held as dependencies by force alone. On the contrary, we had a broad foundation laid, upon which were raised at first only thirteen columns, a portion of an indefinite number which were to be erected during a long future, all of one material and equal strength, and all to be combined inseparably, according to one great original design.

New states, ultimately to become members of the Federal Union, pass through stages of unorganized colonization, and of dependence and pupilage under the federal government, or that of some foreign power, and receive their biases and even form their social institutions during those early stages. Nevertheless, so intimate is the union of all these states, that each exerts no measured influence upon every other, while the fortune of any one is inseparably involved in the common destiny of all.

You will infer at once from these statements, that the nature and character of the institutions, of even any one maturing territory in the United States, are subjects of the highest and possibly even vital importance. That, although caprice and oppression may be harmlessly practised by other nations upon their provinces and colonies, yet such wrongs, committed by our federal government against our growing territories, are equally injurious to those territories, and dangerous, if not disastrous, to the whole republic.

It is my purpose to show you, on this occasion, that the slaveholding class of the American people is systematically and successfully perverting the administration of the government, especially in regard to the territories, so as to change the constitution and endanger the stability, welfare and liberty of the Union.

First, insomuch as this proposition must seem to you bold, if not new, I shall show from general principles that it may possibly be true; and secondly, I shall establish its truth by undeniable demonstration.

First: The proposition may be true. Property is an essential element of civil society. So is liberty, which, properly understood, is only the equal security of all citizens against oppression. How to adjust the balance between property and liberty in states, is the great problem of government. Property is always jealous of enlarged liberty, and especially so when it is based on relations subversive of natural justice, which is nothing more than equality among men. Property, therefore, has always a bias toward oppression, and it derives power to oppress from its own nature, the watchfulness of its possessors, and the ease with which they can combine. Liberty is exposed to the danger of such oppression by means of the inconsiderateness and the jealousies which habitually prevail among subjects or citizens. In every state all the property classes sympathize with each other, through the force of common instincts of fear, cupidity and ambition, and are easily marshaled under the lead of one which becomes dominant and represents the whole. Wherever the rights and duties of the property classes are defined and regulated, with sufficient constraints to prevent oppression, and liberty is at the same time so bounded as to secure property against social or individual aggression, there the people are free and the state is republican. Where this balance is not accurately adjusted, liberty is abridged, and a property class administers the government, in the form of an aristocracy, or a monarchy, or a despotism. The mere mention of the names of Switzerland, Venice, France (her various alternations being remembered), Great Britain and Russia, furnishes all needful illustrations of these positions. Human nature and the physical elements of society are everywhere the same. It is therefore possible that social and political errors and evils which have frequently existed elsewhere, may find entrance here.

Secondly: The allegation of the perversion of the government by the slave property class, which I have made, is true. First, let us see whether such a direction of the government as it describes was designed or expected by its founders. On the contrary, they laid the foundations of the states, not in property—much less in slave property—but in the natural rights or political equality of men.

They established few safeguards of property, knowing how apt it is to take care of itself, while they built strong bulwarks around liberty, knowing how easily liberty is everywhere overthrown. The Declaration of Independence, which no weak or wicked citizen then dared to pronounce a series of abstractions, recited as the fundamental truth of the great political society which it ushered into the presence of nations, that "all men are created equal"—"endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights" of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" and that "governments are instituted among men to secure those rights," and derive their powers only "from the consent of the governed."

The convention which framed the constitution, submitted it to the American people by a letter bearing the signature of George Washington, in which its character was defined with a steady hand in a clear light. "Individuals," said the convention, "entering into society, must give up *a share* of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstances as on the object to be attained. In all our deliberations on this subject, the object which the convention has kept steadily in view was the consolidation of the Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each state in the convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected." An analysis of the constitution, especially including its amendment, justifies this declaration, that the points on which liberality of concession to property was exercised, were only those of inferior magnitude, and that neither prosperity, felicity, safety nor national existence, was intended to be put at hazard for the preservation of a mere remnant or shadow of liberty. The people, speaking in the constitution, declared their high objects in that great transaction in words simple, majestic and comprehensive, "to form a perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." They boldly and directly laid the axe to the roots of privileges and of classes, they broke the very mainsprings of aristocracy, or at least they attempted to do so, by ordaining that "no title of nobility shall be granted by the United States, or by any state;" and that "congress shall make no law respecting an

establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Although the people well knew that nearly every fourth person in the new republic was actually a slave, and that perhaps one of every twenty persons was a slaveholder—and so they well understood the existence among themselves of caste and class—yet they pertinaciously refused to recognize either, and, on the contrary, treated of all the subjects of the government, under the common and promiscuous description of "persons," thus confounding classes and recognizing only men. While they aimed at an ultimate extinction of that caste, and the class built upon it, by authorizing congress to prohibit the importation of "persons" who were slaves, after 1808, and to tax it severely in the meantime, and while they necessarily left to the individual states the management of the domestic relations of all classes and castes existing therein, they especially declared what should be the rights and relations of all "persons," so far as they were to be affected by the action of the federal government which they were establishing. "The privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended, unless, when, in case of rebellion or invasion, the public security shall require it." "No bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law shall be passed." "No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census." "The United States shall guaranty to every state in the Union a republican form of government." "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated." They ordained "trial by jury," prohibited "excessive bail and excessive fines, and cruel and unusual punishments," and "reserved to the states and to the people all the powers of government not expressly delegated to the United States."

Among these broad and comprehensive reservations of liberty, only two inferior and guarded stipulations were made with the slaveholding class—namely, that "no person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due;" and that "representatives and taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which shall be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number

of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, *three-fifths of all other persons.*"

It is manifest that congress cannot, without violating the rights of the people reserved by their constitution, grant any favor or privilege or advantage to the slaveholding class, or even ordain or permit slavery to exist within the exclusive sphere of the federal jurisdiction. The spirit of the Declaration of Independence and of the constitution of the United States, thus flagrantly hostile to classes, and especially to the slaveholding class, entered largely into the contemporaneous constitution and laws of most of the states. All of them established republican forms of government. Most of them asserted the political equality of men. All of them prohibited orders of nobility and ecclesiastical classes, estates in mortmain, and estates by primogeniture. Seven states immediately or speedily prohibited slavery, and all of the others earnestly debated the same great and benign reform. Finally, though unable thus early to abolish slavery in six of the states where it already existed, the people in the revolutionary congress effectually provided for excluding it forever in that part of the national domain which laid northwest of the Ohio, and in the states which were thereafter to be established there.

I think, fellow citizens, that I have shown to your abundant satisfaction that such a direction of the administration to the establishment and aggrandizement of the slaveholding class, as I have charged, if it indeed exists, is a perversion of the constitution of the United States.

Seventy years of our national history have been fulfilled. Fix your attention for a moment now on the slaveholding class, as it now exists. Although it has been abolished by state legislation in seven of the first thirteen states, and although nine free states which exclude it have since been admitted into the Union, yet the slaveholding class nevertheless stands erect and firm in fifteen of the present thirty-one states, numbering three hundred and forty-seven thousand "persons," on the basis of three millions two hundred and four thousand other "persons" held to labor or service by the laws thereof, valued at twelve hundred millions of dollars, combined practically with all the real estates in those states. This class spreads itself on the one bank of the Mississippi to the Kansas river, and on the other to the Ohio, and along the Atlantic coast from the banks

of the Delaware to those of the Rio Grande. In the states where this class exists, it is not merely secure—it is permanent and completely dominant, to the exclusion not merely of all civil rights on the part of the "persons who are held to labor or service" by it, but to the inhibition of voluntary emancipation by the owners of slaves, to the practical exclusion of free labor from the state, and with it freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of the ballot box, freedom of education, freedom of literature, and freedom of popular assemblies. Thus established by municipal institutions, the slaveholding class has become the governing power in each of the slaveholding states, and it practically chooses thirty of the sixty-two members of the senate, ninety of the two hundred and thirty-three members of the house of representatives, and one hundred and five of the two hundred and ninety-five electors of president and vice-president of the United States.

Let us now repair to the federal capital. You see, that although it is sadly wanting in the elements of industry and enterprise, which distinguish the hundred cities of the free states, yet it is a respectable metropolis, rich in costly national structures, monuments and gardens. This elegant and tasteful edifice is the palace of the president of the United States. Its incumbent, you know him right well (for he has acquired a painful notoriety), is a confessed apologist of the slave-property class, a libeler of freemen and free states, which resist the aggressions of that class, an abettor of the extension of slavery, and of the enlargement of the domain of that class, by the violation of time-honored compacts, by armed usurpations, conquest and judicial corruption. You remember his history. He had been equally obscure among civilians and generals, but he was deemed reliable by the slave-property class to suppress debate on its high pretensions, and he was therefore advanced to the chief magistracy, to the exclusion of the most heroic, magnanimous, and successful military chief the country has produced.

This broad highway is Pennsylvania avenue; it leads between stately storehouses and dwellings, occupied by slaveholders with their slaves, to the capitol. We ascend the terrace, through groves embellished with statues and fountains, and enter the senate chamber. The senate is before us. It is an august assembly of ambassadors, deputed by thirty-one equal states. It is august by reason of its functions. It is an executive council, and exercises a negative voice

on all appointments to all places of trust, honor or profit, in the republic, and a negative also on all treaties of the republic with foreign nations. As a court of impeachment, it tries all political crimes committed by public agents, and as a legislative body its concurrence is necessary to the passage of all the laws of the Union. The age, experience and dignity of its members, together with the facility for transacting business which it derives from the smallness of its numbers, has enabled it to become the dominating political power in the republic. The chair belongs to the vice-president of the United States. He who was last advanced to that office is now dead. You remember him. He was chosen from a slave state. The senate elected in his place David R. Atchison. You know him well. He was chief statesman and captain in the usurpation and conquest recently effected by the slaveholding class in Kansas. When his duties in that relation called him away from the capital, his place there was assigned to Jesse D. Bright of Indiana. You know him also. He is acceptable and approved by the slave-property class, and he has deserved to be.

At the feet of the presiding officer you see three secretaries, while his chair is surrounded by printers, sergeants at arms, door-keepers and pages. Each of them is either an active or passive advocate of the policy of the slaveholding class.

The business of the day opens with a debate on the relations of the country toward Great Britain and Central America—a theme involving not merely immediate peace or war, but ultimately the continental ascendancy of the republic. The debate is instituted on the motion of the committee on foreign relations. The chairman of that committee is Mr. James M. Mason of Virginia, author of the last and most notorious of the fugitive slave laws. The other members are, Mr. Stephen A. Douglas, the founder of that curious and evanescent system of territorial government, whilom known by the name of Popular Sovereignty, but now recognized as Executive Usurpation; Mr. John A. Slidell of Louisiana, the same who has proposed a withdrawal of the naval squadron employed in suppressing the slave trade on the coast of Africa; Mr. John M. Clayton of Delaware, who pronounces the prohibition of slavery forever, contained in the Missouri compromise, unconstitutional; Mr. John B. Weller, of California, who upholds the executive usurpation and conquest in Kansas; and with these gentlemen is associated one

opponent of the slaveholding class, namely, my honorable and excellent colleague, Mr. Hamilton Fish of New York.

The debate has ended while we have been canvassing the committee by which it was instituted. And now the question has changed to one of hardly less grave importance, namely, whether the president of the United States shall be inhibited from employing the army as a police to enforce the tyrannical laws of the slaveholding conquerors of Kansas. This proposition of the house of representatives is opposed by the committee on finance. That committee has for its chairman Mr. Robert M. T. Hunter, also of Virginia. He is the same senator who has just now proposed to rescind that vote of the senate which rather admitted than declared that the assault made by Preston S. Brooks, a representative of South Carolina, in the senate chamber, on Mr. Charles Sumner, a senator of Massachusetts, for words spoken in debate, was a breach of the privileges of the senate. The other members of this great committee are Mr. James A. Pearce of Maryland, whom you see in his place, franking for circulation his declaration in favor of the slaveholders' candidate for the presidency; Mr. Crittenden of Kentucky, the same senator who, as attorney-general, removed Mr. Fillmore's scruples concerning the suspension of the *habeas corpus* in the new fugitive slave law; Mr. Stuart of Michigan; Mr. Brodhead of Pennsylvania; and Mr. Toucey of Connecticut, all of whom are denouncers of that agitation which consists in exposing the aggressions of the slaveholding class upon the liberties of the American people.

The senate needs but little time on a question so simple as that which has thus been raised. It has already vindicated the president's prerogative, and has now reached the third among the orders of the day, namely, the improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi, a measure introduced by the committee on commerce. This committee has an aspect of unusual equality. For although it embraces Mr. Clay of Alabama, and Mr. Benjamin of Louisiana, who are eminent champions of the rights of slaveholders, it nevertheless has for its other members Mr. Hamlin, the newly elected governor of Maine, the very ultra opponent of the slaveholding class who is now addressing you, and Mr. Dodge of Wisconsin, who is its chairman. But this equality is in part accidental. The chairman votes against the slaveholding class, under the plea of instructions given him by

the state which he represents. Mr. Hamlin was yet in full communion with the slaveholding democracy when he was appointed to this committee, and my own place on it was assigned to me while as yet I was a national whig, and not, as now, a republican.

The debates in the senate interrupt us. Let us therefore forget them, and proceed with our examination of the constitution of its committees. The committee on manufactures seems to have been framed with decided impartiality. At its head is Mr. Wright of New Jersey, a supporter of the policy of the slaveholding class, while its other members are Mr. Allen of Rhode Island, a moderate opponent of the Nebraska and Kansas law, and Mr. Harlan of Iowa, Mr. Wilson of Massachusetts, and Mr. Trumbull of Illinois, three distinguished and effective advocates of freedom.

I admit a similar equality in the constitution of the committee on agriculture, for it consists of the same Mr. Allen and Mr. Harlan, together with the indomitable Mr. Wade of Ohio, who are friends of freedom, and also Mr. Thomson of New Jersey, and Mr. Hunter of Virginia, who are defenders of the rights of slaveholders.

Glad to be just to that class, I acknowledge with pleasure that equal liberality has been manifested in the organization of the committee on the militia. Its chairman is Mr. Houston of Texas, and with him is associated Mr. Bell, a true representative of New Hampshire, as she was of old, is now and always ought to be; and these certainly are not overbalanced by Mr. Dodge of Wisconsin, Mr. Biggs of North Carolina, and Mr. Thompson of Kentucky.

I must nevertheless claim as a drawback on the magnanimity of the senate, that these three last committees, namely, those "on manufactures," "on agriculture," and "on the militia," have charge of public interests which have long since been renounced by the federal government in favor of the states, and that consequently those committees are understood to be merely nominal, and that in fact they never submit any measures for the consideration of congress.

On the other hand we see prudence, if not jealousy, visibly manifested in the constitution of the committee on the army and the navy, the two great physical forces of the republic. The first of these consists of Mr. Weller of California, Mr. Fitzpatrick of Alabama, Mr. Jones of Tennessee, Mr. Iverson of Georgia, and Mr. Pratt of Maryland, all of whom favor the largest liberty to the slaveholding class; and the other is composed of Mr. Mallory of Florida, Mr.

Slidell of Louisiana, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. James of Rhode Island, all reliable supporters of that class, together with the independent, upright, and candid John Bell of Tennessee.

The slaveholding class is a careful guardian of the public domain. Mr. Stuart, of Michigan, is chairman of the committee on public lands. He is, as you well know, of the opinion that the agitation of slavery is the prolific cause of the unhappy overthrow of freedom in Kansas, and his associates are Mr. Johnson of Arkansas, Mr. Clayton of Delaware, Mr. Mallory of Florida and Mr. Pugh of Ohio, who all are tolerant of that overthrow, and Mr. Foot, who so faithfully represents the ever-reliable freemen of Vermont.

Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, presides over the committee on private claims upon the public domain, supported by Mr. Biggs of North Carolina and Mr. Thompson of Kentucky, with whom are associated Mr. Foster, a senator of redeemed Connecticut, and Mr. Wilson of Massachusetts.

Negotiations with the Indian tribes are continually required, to provide room for the migration of the slaveholder with his slaves. The committee on Indian affairs, excluding all senators from free states, consists of Mr. Sebastian of Arkansas, Mr. Rusk of Texas, Mr. Toombs of Georgia, Mr. Brown of Mississippi, Mr. Reid of North Carolina and Mr. Bell of Tennessee.

Two representatives of the interests of freedom, Mr. Wade of Ohio, and Mr. Fessenden of Maine, hold places on the committee on claims against the government; but they are quite overbalanced by Mr. Brodhead of Pennsylvania, Mr. Geyer of Missouri, Mr. Iverson of Georgia, and Mr. Yulee of Florida.

The post office in its transactions is more nearly domestic and municipal than any other department of the government, and comes home to the business and bosoms of the whole people. Mr. Rusk of Texas, is chairman of the committee on the post office and post roads, and his associates are Mr. Yulee of Florida, Mr. Adams of Mississippi, Mr. Jones of Iowa, balanced by Mr. Collamer of Vermont, and Mr. Durkee of Wisconsin.

No inconsiderate legislation favorable to freemen must be allowed in the senate, no constitutional legislation necessary to the security of slavery must be spared. The committee on the judiciary, charged with the care of the public jurisprudence, consists of Mr. Butler of South Carolina, Mr. Bayard of Delaware, Mr. Geyer of Missouri,

Mr. Toombs of Georgia, Mr. Toucey of Connecticut, and Mr. Pugh of Ohio. It was the committee on the judiciary which, in 1845, reported the bill for removing from the state courts into the federal courts private actions brought against federal officers for injuries committed by them under color of their authority.

The slaveholding class watches with paternal jealousy over the slaveholding capital of the United States. The committee on the District of Columbia consists of Mr. Brown of Mississippi, Mr. Pratt of Maryland, Mr. Mason of Virginia, and Mr. Reid of North Carolina, together with Mr. Allen of Rhode Island.

The committee on territories has care of the colonization, organization, and admission of new states, and so is in fact the most important of all the committees in the senate. Mr. Douglas, of Illinois, is its chairman, and his associates are his willing supporters, Mr. Jones of Iowa, Mr. Sebastian of Arkansas, Mr. Biggs of North Carolina, together with Mr. Bell of Tennessee, and the able and faithful Mr. Collamer of Vermont.

Finally, the science and literature of the country must not be unduly directed to the prejudice of the interests of slavery. The committee on the library take charge of this great intellectual interest, and it consists of Mr. Pearce of Maryland, Mr. Cass, the eminent senator from Michigan, and Mr. Bayard of Delaware.

You will say that my review of the committees of the senate is unjust, because you have not heard me mention the names of those distinguished champions of freedom in the senate, John P. Hale of New Hampshire, and Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. Behold the places assigned to them! Mr. Hale graces the committees on "revolutionary claims" and on "public buildings," and Mr. Sumner fills a seat in the "committee on pensions."

Do not think for a moment that I impeach the justice of the senate in the construction of its committees. When you learn how strong the slaveholding interest in the senate really is, you will perceive at once that its representatives are more than just—they are even liberal and generous to its adversaries. You shall decide the question for yourselves, when I shall have called the roll. Taking the admission of Kansas into the Union, under the Topeka constitution, as a test, the classification of the senate is as follows: Rhode Island, two voices for slavery; Connecticut, one; New Jersey, one; Pennsylvania, two; Delaware, two; Maryland, two; Virginia, two; North

Carolina, two; South Carolina, two; Georgia, two; Alabama, two; Mississippi, two; Louisiana, two; Ohio, one; Kentucky, two; Tennessee, two; Indiana, one; Illinois, one; Missouri, one; Arkansas, two; Michigan, two; Florida, two; Texas, two; Iowa, one; Wisconsin, one; California, one; in all, twenty-six states, giving forty-three voices for slavery. For freedom—Maine, two; New Hampshire, two; Vermont, two; Massachusetts, two; Connecticut, one; New York, two; Ohio, one; Illinois, one; Iowa, one; only nine states, giving only fourteen voices for freedom.

Freemen of Michigan, I think I perceive that you are oppressed with the atmosphere of the senate of the United States. I cheerfully leave it. We have crossed the rotunda, so rich in memorials of the patriotism and valor of our ancestors, and now we are in the hall of representatives. The house of representatives consists of two hundred and thirty-three members, chosen severally by the people in representative districts. One hundred and forty-three of them are chosen by the people of the free states. This house virtually holds a controlling power over the senate and the president, through its exclusive right to originate bills for raising public revenue. It is in fact the commons of America. But, alas! if the senate is a strong citadel of slavery, the house of representatives is by no means an impregnable bulwark of freedom. The slaveholding class enjoys no advantages which have not at some time been surrendered to it by the house of representatives. To-day, indeed, we boast of a regenerated house of representatives, faithful to the interests of human freedom. But, after all, our boast is founded less on any vantage ground actually gained by the house of representatives, than on a retreat safely effected from the late legislative contest, instead of an absolute capitulation. God knows that I do not undervalue the brave and true champions of freedom who have honored humanity so long in the house of representatives; John Quincy Adams, Giddings, Thaddeus Stevens, Preston King, David Wilmot, John A. King, heretofore; and now, Grow, and Banks, and Burlingame, and Howard, and Sherman, and Morgan, and Colfax, and the Washburnes all. But I ask, nevertheless, what have we saved in this last, our only successful contest in the house of representatives? Whitfield, the representative of the Missouri borderers in Kansas, only expelled, and Reeder, the true representative of that territory, rejected; a speaker, faithful to justice and humanity, barely chosen

by a plurality; an investigation into the atrocious crimes of Kansas, barely sustained; a meager plurality vote for the admission of Kansas, under the Topeka constitution, rendered half worthless by an embarrassment of the question with an incongruous vote for a reörganization of the territorial government; and an eight months' struggle for the equal independence of the house of representatives, closed with a concession of absolute independence to the senate, by consenting to its dictation in a bill directing the supplies for the support of the civil authorities and the army of the United States.

Enough of the house of representatives. Come along with me, fellow citizens. This passage, circuitous and descending, leads us into the chamber of the supreme court of the United States. It is an imposing tribunal; a great conservative department of the government. It regulates the administration of justice between citizens of the different states, and between states themselves. Its members are independent of the legislature and of the president, and it has the power of setting aside even laws and treaties, if it find them subversive of the constitution of the United States. The court is just opened for the business of the day. How fitly does the proclamation of its opening close with the invocation, "God save the United States and this honorable court." See, also, how the memories of the benefactors of mankind are held in honor here. There is the statue of John Jay, the author of emancipation in New York. Alas, our imagination has quite deluded us. The court consists of a chief justice and eight associate justices. Of these, five were called from slave states, and four from free states. The opinions and bias of each of them were carefully considered by the president and senate when he was appointed. Not one of them was found wanting in soundness of politics, according to the slaveholder's exposition of the constitution, and those who were called from the free states were even more distinguished in that respect than their brethren from the slaveholding states.

We have thus completed our survey of the supreme authorities of the republic. Let us now leave the capitol, and look into the subordinate departments.

In this modest edifice is the department of state. It is the depository of the seals of the republic. It directs and regulates the merely executive operations of government at home, and all its foreign relations. Its agents are numbered by the hundred, and they are

dispersed in all civilized countries throughout the world. From the chief here in his bureau to the secretaries of legation in South America, Great Britain, France, Russia, Turkey, and China, there is not one of these agents who has ever rebuked or condemned the extension or aggrandizement of slavery. There is not one who does not even defend and justify it. There is not one who does not maintain that the flag of the United States covers with its protection the slaves of the slaveholding class on the high seas.

In the majestic pile behind this unique but graceful colonnade, sits the secretary of the treasury. He manages the revenues and expenditures of the United States, and guards and improves their sources, commerce and the public lands. Seventy millions of dollars annually pass through his hands into those of other public agents, contractors, creditors, and foreign powers. He directs the movements of agents who, scattered abroad in all the seaports and in all the states and territories, are counted by the thousands. His wand contracts or opens banks, and frees or embargoes the merchant ships which carry on a trade, domestic and foreign, greater than that which any other nation but one has ever maintained. All the national revenues are raised in such a way as to favor most the purely agricultural labor of slaves, and to afford the least impulse to the great wheel of manufacture, which is turned only by the hands of freemen. The custom-houses and the public lands pour forth two golden streams—one into the elections, to procure votes for the slaveholding class; and the other into the treasury, to be enjoyed by those whom it shall see fit to reward with places in the public service.

A walk of half a mile brings us to the portico of a great edifice, faultlessly conforming to the best style of Grecian architecture. This is the department of the interior, and here is its secretary. He is charged with the ministerial part of the administration of justice, with the disposition of the public lands, the construction of buildings, the granting of patents, and the payment of pensions. His agents abound especially in the territories and states, built on the public domain. You see them here among yourselves, and know them well. Did you ever know one of them whose devotion to the slaveholding class could be shaken by any miracle less than that which converted Saul of Tarsus, a persecutor of saints, into a preacher of righteousness?

Merely turning a short corner, we reach the general post office.

This is the great domiciliary inquisition of the government. It reaches, by long arms, with insinuating fingers, every settlement, village, city, and state capital, in forest, prairie, mountain, and plain, among the lakes and rivers of our own country, and pervades with its presence the seas throughout the whole earth. There is not one, of its more than twenty thousand agents, who is false to the slaveholding interest, unless indeed he is so obscure as to have escaped, not merely the notice of the chief of the department itself but also the envy of stimulated avarice and ambition in his own neighborhood.

A circuit of half a mile has now brought us to the departments of "War" and the "Navy." Here two energetic and far-sighted ministers, brought from the slaveholding states, and identified with their policy, wield the two great physical forces of the republic, each ready, on receiving a despatch by telegraph to subdue resistance to reclaimants of fugitive slaves in Boston, to disfranchising statutes in Kansas, or to slave coursers on the high seas.

Finally, in the most unpretending of all the public edifices sits the attorney-general of the United States. It belongs to the office of an attorney-general to be a willing adviser and cunning executioner of the policy of the power by whom he was appointed. When or where, in all the memorable struggles of liberty with prerogative, in this country or in Europe, has this character been more successfully illustrated than it has been by the present attorney-general, in his efforts to establish the interests of the slaveholding class, and crush out its opponents in the free states?

Fellow citizens, you start with astonishment at the picture I have made, by simply bringing together well-known and familiar, but distant, objects into one group, and in a clear light. You say that it cannot be truthful. I reply, if it be not truthful, then let any one here, whatever may be his political bias or associations, point out a single figure that is wrongly placed on the canvas, or show a spot where the cold and passionless shadowing I have given to it ought to be mellowed.

You are impatient of my theme, but I cannot release you yet. Mark, if you please, that thus far I have only shown you the mere governmental organization of the slaveholding class in the United States, and pointed out its badges of supremacy, suggestive of your own debasement and humiliation. Contemplate now the reality of

the power of that class, and the condition to which the cause of human nature has been reduced. In all the free states, the slaveholder argues and debates the pretensions of his class, and even prosecutes his claim for his slave before the delegate of the federal government, with safety and boldness, as he ought. He exhorts the citizens of the free states to acquiesce, and even threatens them, in their very homes, with the terrors of disunion, if that acquiescence is withheld; and he does all this with safety, as he ought, if it be done at all. He is listened to with patience, and replied to with decorum, even in his most arrogant declamations, in the halls of congress. Through the effective sympathy of other property classes, the slaveholding power maintains with entire safety presses and permanent political organizations in all the free states. On the contrary, if you except the northern border of Delaware, there is nowhere in any slaveholding state personal safety for a citizen, even of that state itself, who questions the rightful national domination of the slaveholding class. Debate of its pretensions, in the halls of congress, is carried on at the perils of limb and life. A free press is no sooner set up in a slaveholding state, than it is demolished, and citizens who assemble peacefully to discuss even the extremest claims of slavery are at first cautioned, and, if that is ineffectual, banished or slain, even more surely than the resistants of military despotism in the French empire. Nor, except just now, has the case been much better, even in the free states. It is only as of yesterday, when the free citizens, assembled to discuss the exactions of the slaveholding class, were dispersed in Boston, Utica, Philadelphia, and New York. It is only as of yesterday, that when I rose, on request of citizens of Michigan, at Marshall, to speak of the great political questions of the day, I was enjoined not to make disturbance or to give offence by speaking of free soil, and this was when I was standing as I am now on the very ground which the ordinance of 1787 had saved to freedom. It was only as of yesterday, that protestant churches and theological seminaries, built on Puritan foundations, vied with the organs of the slaveholding class in denouncing a legislator who, in the act of making laws affecting its interests, declared that all human laws ought to be conformed to the standard of eternal justice. The day has even not yet passed when the press, employed in the service of education and morality, expurgates from the books which are put into the hands of the young all reflections on slavery. The

day yet lasts when the flag of the United States flaunts defiance on the high seas, over cargoes of human merchandise. Nor is there an American representative anywhere, in any one of the four quarters of the globe, that does not labor to suppress even there the discussion of American slavery, lest it may possibly affect the safety of the slaveholding class at home. If, in a generous burst of sympathy with the struggling protestant democracy of Europe, we bring off the field one of their fallen champions, to condole with and comfort him, we suddenly discern that the mere agitation of the principles of freedom tends to alarm the slaveholding class, and we cast him off again as a waif, not merely worthless, but dangerous to ourselves. The natural and ancient order of things is reversed; freedom has become subordinate, sectional, and local; slavery in its influences and combinations has become predominant, national, and general. Free, direct, and manly utterance in the cause of freedom, even in the free states themselves, leads to ostracism, while superserviceability to the slaveholding class alone secures preferment in the national councils. The descendants of Franklin, and Hamilton, and Jay, and King, are unprized—

> ——"till they learn to betray,
> Undistinguish'd they live, if they shame not their sires,
> And the torch that would light them to dignity's way,
> Must be caught from the pile when their country expires."

In this course of rapid public demoralization, what wonder is it that the action of the government tends continually with fearfully augmenting force to the aggrandizement of the slaveholding class? A government can never be better or wiser, or even so good or so wise as the people over whom it presides? Who can wonder, then, that the congress of the United States, in 1820, gave to slavery the west bank of the Mississippi quite up to the present line of Kansas, and was content to save for freedom, out of the vast region of Louisiana, only Kansas and Nebraska? Who can wonder that it consented to annex and admit Texas, with power to subdivide herself into five slave states, so as to secure the slaveholding class a balance against the free states then expected to be ultimately organized in Kansas and Nebraska? Who can wonder, that when this annexation of Texas brought on a war with Mexico, which ended in the annexation of Upper California and New Mexico, every foot

of which was free from African slavery, congress divided that vast territory, admitting the new state of California reluctantly as a free state, because she would not consent to establish slavery, dismembered New Mexico, transferred a large portion of it to slaveholding Texas, and stipulated that what remained of New Mexico, together with Utah, should be received as slave states, if the people thereof should so demand? Who can wonder that the president, without any reproof by congress, simultaneously offered to Spain two hundred millions of dollars for the purchase of Cuba, that it might be divided into two slaveholding states, to be admitted as members of the Federal Union, and at the same time menaced the European powers with war if they should interfere to prevent the consummation of the purchase? Who can wonder that, emboldened with these concessions of the people, congress at last sanctioned a reprisal by the slaveholding class upon the regions of Kansas and Nebraska, not on the ground of justice or for an equivalent, but simply on the pretence that the original concession of them to freedom was extorted by injustice and unconstitutional oppression by the free states? Who can wonder that the slaveholding class, when it had obtained the sanction of congress to that reprisal, by giving a pledge that the people of those territories should be perfectly free nevertheless to establish freedom therein, invaded the territory of Kansas with armed forces, inaugurated a usurpation, and established slavery there, and disfranchised the supporters of freedom by tyrannical laws, enforced by fire and sword, and that the president and senate now maintain and uphold the slaveholding interests in these culminating demonstrations of their power, while the house of representatives lacks the power, because it is wanting in the virtue, to rescue the interests of justice, freedom, and humanity? Who can wonder that federal courts in Massachusetts indict defenders of freedom for sedition, and in Pennsylvania subvert the state tribunals, and pervert the *habeas corpus*, the great writ of liberty, into a process for arresting fugitive slaves, and construe into contempt, punishable by imprisonment without bail or mainprize, the simple and truthful denial of personal control over a fugitive female slave, who has made her own voluntary escape from bondage?[1] Who can wonder that in Kansas lawyers may not plead or juries be impanneled in

1 See Memoir, *ante*, page 36.

the federal courts, nor can even citizens vote, without first swearing to support the fugitive slave law and the Kansas and Nebraska act, while citizens who discuss through the press the right of slaveholders to domineer there, are punished with imprisonment or death; free bridges over which citizens who advocate free institutions, may pass, free taverns where they may rest, and free presses through which they may speak, are destroyed under indictments for nuisances; and those who peacefully assemble to debate the grievances of that class, and petition congress for relief, are indicted for high treason?

Just now, the wind sets with some apparent steadiness in the north, and you will readily confess therefore that I do not exaggerate the growing aggrandizement of the slaveholding class, but you will nevertheless insist that that aggrandizement is now and may be merely temporary and occasional. A moment's reflection, however, will satisfy you that this opinion is profoundly untrue. What is now seen is only the legitimate maturing of errors unresisted through a period of nearly forty years. All the fearful evils now upon us are only the inevitable results of efforts to extinguish, by delays, concession, and compromises, a discussion to which justice, reason, and humanity, are continually lending their elemental fires.

What, then, is the tendency of this aggrandizement of the slave interest, and what must be its end, if it be not now or speedily arrested? Immediate consequences are distinctly in view. The admission of Kansas into the Union as a slave state, the subsequent introduction of slavery by means equally flagrant into Nebraska, and the admission of Utah with the twin patriarchal institutions of legalized adultery and slavery, and these three achievements crowned with the incorporation of Cuba into the republic. Beyond these visible fields lies a region of fearful speculation—the restoration of the African slave trade, and the desecration of all Mexico and Central America, by the infliction upon the half-civilized Spanish and Indian races dwelling there, by our hands, of a curse from which, inferior as they are to ourselves, they have had the virtue once to redeem themselves. Beyond this area last surveyed lies that of civil and servile wars, national decline and—RUIN.

I fear to open up these distant views, because I know that you will attribute my apprehensions to a morbid condition of mind. But confining myself to the immediate future which is so fearfully palpable, I ask you in all candor, first, whether I have ever before

exaggerated the aggrandizement of the slaveholding class. Secondly, whether the movement that I now forbode is really more improbable than the evils once seemed, which are now a startling reality.

How are these immediate evils, and whatever of greater evils that are behind them, to be prevented? Do you expect that those who have heretofore counseled compromise, acquiescence, and submission, will change their course, and come to the rescue of liberty? Even if this were a reasonable hope, are Cass, and Douglas, and Buchanan, greater or better than the statesmen who have opened the way of compromise, and led these modern statesmen into it? And if they indeed are so much greater and so much better, do you expect them to live forever?

Perhaps you expect the slaveholding class will abate its pretension, and practice voluntarily the moderation which you wish, but dare not demand at its hands. How long, and with what success, have you waited already for that reformation? Did any property class ever so reform itself? Did the patricians in old Rome, the noblesse or the clergy in France? the landholders in Ireland? the landed aristocracy in England? Does the slaveholding class even seek to beguile you with such a hope? Has it not become rapacious, arrogant, defiant? Is it not waging civil war against freedom, wherever it encounters real resistance? No! no! you have let the lion and the spotted leopard into the sheep-fold. They certainly will not die of hunger there, nor retire from disgust with satiety. They will remain there so long as renewed appetite shall find multiplied prey. Be not self-deceived. Whenever a property class of any kind is invited by society to oppress, it will continue to oppress. Whenever a slaveholding class finds the non-slaveholding classes yielding, it will continue its work of subjugation.

People of Michigan, I know full well that it seems ungracious in me to dwell on this painful theme. It is not such an acknowledgment of your manifold hospitalities as you expected. It is hard for the weary mariner to look steadily on the newly revealed rocks toward which he has too long been carelessly drifting. It is not easy for the prodigal to look with contentment on the rags and husks which meet him as he retires from the house of his harlotry. Nevertheless, there is no way of escaping any imminent danger, without first calmly and steadily looking it fully in the face and ascertaining its real nature and magnitude.

Here again you will deny the justice of my parallels; you will claim to be merely innocent and unfortunate, and will upbraid the slaveholding class as the builders of this impending ruin. But you cannot escape in that way. The fault is not at all with that class, but with yourselves. The slaveholders only act according to their constitutions, education and training. It is the non-slaveholding classes in the free states who are recreant to their own constitutions, and false to their own instincts and impulses, and even to their own true interests. Who taught the slaveholding class that freedom, which could not be wholly conquered at once, could be yielded in successive halves by successive compromises? Who taught the slaveholding class the specious theories of non-intervention and popular sovereignty, and the absolute obligation of tyrannical laws enacted by armed usurpation? Your own Cass, and Douglas, and Pierce, and Buchanan. Who established Cass, Douglas, Pierce and Buchanan at Washington, and gave them the power to march their slaveholding armies into Kansas? The non-slaveholding society in the free states, and no portion of that society more willingly and more recklessly than you, the people of Michigan.

You admit all this, and you ask how are these great evils, now so apparent, to be corrected—these great dangers, now so manifest, to be avoided. I answer, it is to be done, not as some of you have supposed, by heated debates sustained by rifles or revolvers at Washington, nor yet by sending armies with supplies and Sharpe's rifles into Kansas; I condemn no necessary exercise of the right of self-defence anywhere. Public safety is necessary to the practice of the real duties of champions of freedom. But this is a contest in which the race is not to the physically swift, nor the battle to those who have most muscular strength. Least of all is it to be won by retaliation and revenge. The victory will be to those who shall practise the highest moral courage, with simple fidelity to the principles of humanity and justice. Notwithstanding all the heroism of your champions in Washington and Kansas, the contest will be fearfully endangered if the slaveholding class shall win the president and the congress in this great national canvass. Even although every one of these champions should perish in his proper field, yet the rights of man will be saved, and the tide of oppression will be rolled back from our northern plains, if a president and a congress shall be chosen who are true to freedom. The people, and the people only, are

sovereign and irresistible, whether they will the ascendancy of slavery, or the triumph of liberty.

Harsh as my words may have seemed, I do my kinsmen and brethren of the free states no such injustice as to deny that great allowances are to be made for the demoralization I have described. We inherited complicity with the slaveholding class, and with it prejudices of caste. We inherited confidence and affection toward our southern brethren—and with these, our political organizations and our profound reverence for political authorities, all adverse to the needful discussion of slavery. Above all, we inherited a fear of the dissolution of the Union, which can only be unwholesome when it ceases equally to affect the conduct of all the great parties to that sacred compact. All these inheritances have created influences upon our political conduct, which are rather to be deplored than condemned. I trust that at last these influences are about to cease. I trust so, because, if we have inherited the demoralization of slavery, we have also attained the virtue required for emancipation. If we have inherited prejudices of caste, we have also risen to the knowledge that political safety is dependent on the rendering of equal and exact justice to all men. And if we have suffered our love for the Union to be abused so as to make us tolerate the evils that more than all others endanger it, we have discerned that great error at last. If we should see a citizen, who had erected a noble edifice, sit down inactively in its chambers, avoiding all duty and enterprise, lest he might provoke enemies to pull it down over his head; or one who had built a majestic vessel, moor it to the wharf, through fear that he might peradventure run it upon the rocks, we should condemn his fatuity and folly. We have learned at last that the American people labor not only under the responsibility of preserving this Union, but also under the responsibility of making it subserve the advancement of justice and humanity, and that neglect of this last responsibility involves the chief peril to which the Union itself is exposed.

I shall waste little time on the newly-invented apologies for continued demoralization. The question now to be decided is, whether a slaveholding class exclusively shall govern America, or whether it shall only bear divided sway with non-slaveholding citizens. It concerns all persons equally, whether they are protestants or catholics, native-born or exotic citizens. And therefore it seems to me that this is no time for trials of strength between the native-born

and the adopted freemen, or between any two branches of one common Christian brotherhood.

As little shall I dwell on merely personal partialities or prejudices affecting the candidates for public trusts. Each fitly personates the cause he represents. Beyond a doubt, Mr. Buchanan is faithful to the slaveholding class, as Mr. Fillmore vascillates between it and its opponents. I know Mr. Fremont well; and when I say that I know that he combines extraordinary genius and unquestionable sincerity of purpose, with unusual modesty, I am sure that you will admit that he is a true representative of the cause of freedom.

Discarding sectionalism, and loving my country and all its parts, and bearing an affection even to the slaveholding class, none the less sincere because it repels me, I cordially adopt the motto which it too often hangs out to delude us. I know no north, no south, no east and no west; for I know that he who would offer an acceptable sacrifice in the present crisis must conform himself to the divine instructions, that neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, shall we worship the Father; but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

Last of all, I stop not to argue with those who decry agitation and extol conservatism, not knowing that conservatism is of two kinds—that one which, yielding to cowardly fear of present inconvenience or danger, covers even political leprosy with protecting folds; and that other and better conservatism, that heals, in order that the body of the commonwealth may be healthful and immortal.

Fellow citizens, I am aware that I have spoken with seriousness amounting to solemnity. Do not infer from thence that I am despondent and distrustful of present triumph and ultimate regeneration. It has required a strong pressure upon the main-spring of the public virtue to awaken its elasticity. Such pressure has reached the center of the spring at last. They who have reckoned that its elasticity was lost, are now discovering their profound mistake. The people of the United States have dallied long with the flowers of the *acactus*, and floated carelessly on the calm seas that always reflect summer skies, but they have not lost their preference for their own changeless *fleur de lis*, and they consult no other guidance, in their course over the waters, than that of their own bright, particular and constant star, the harbinger of liberty.

THE POLITICAL PARTIES OF THE DAY.

AUBURN, OCTOBER 21, 1856.

WE are neighbors and friends. We know each other well. I know that you are sincere, and you know, as I trust, that I am a man of not ungrateful disposition. We have a common memory of many long and inclement political storms through which we have passed, not altogether without occasional alienations and separations. You, therefore, can readily conceive, without amplification on my part, how profoundly gratifying it is to me now to see not only a general brightening of the skies, auspicious of the triumph of the political principles which I have cherished through so many trials, but also troops and crowds and clouds of friends, more numerous, more earnest and more confiding than those by whom I was surrounded in the most successful and happiest periods of my earlier life.

If politics were indeed, as many seem to suppose, merely an uncertain sea, bounded on all sides by rich ports and havens tempting private adventure, I should not be one of those who, standing on the beach, would be inciting my fellow citizens to commit themselves on board this party craft or of the other. If politics were, as others seem to think, merely a game cunningly compounded of courage, accident and skill, in which prizes and crowns were to be won by the victors for their own glory and the excitement of the multitude, I certainly should not be found among the heralds of the contestants on either side. If, again, politics were only a forum in which social theories, without immediate bearing on the welfare and safety of the country, were discussed, I might then be a listener, but I should not be a disputant.

But, although politics present these aspects to superficial observers, they are nevertheless far more serious and practical in their real character. They are the regulation and direction of the actual life of the American people. How much of individual, domestic and

social happiness depends on the regulation and conduct of only one single human life! How vastly more of human happiness depends then on the regulation and conduct of the whole nation's thousand-fold longer life!

Since I have come before you on this occasion under the influence of these sentiments, you will not expect from me either humorous, exaggerated, passionate or prejudiced speech, but will rather calculate on an examination of the merits of candidates for public favor, and of the parties by whom those candidates are respectively sustained.

It is not my habit to speak largely of candidates. I refrain for two reasons; First, because being necessarily brought into personal combination or conflict with public men, my judgment concerning them is liable to the bias of partiality or of jealousy; secondly, because it is not the habit of parties in our country to select unfit, unworthy or unreliable men to be their representatives. Whatever may be the personal merits or demerits of a candidate, he cannot act otherwise, if he be chosen, than as an agent of the majority to whom he owes his place. The real question, therefore, in every canvass, is, what are the merits of a party by whom a candidate is preferred?—and inquiries concerning the personal characters and dispositions of candidates are wasted on a false and delusive issue. You can try the truth of this position at once, by inquiring of whomsoever assails the candidate of your choice, whether he would give his support to that candidate, abandoning his own, if all his objections could at once be removed. Your opponent, if a candid man, would probably answer in the negative.

But the case is quite different with political parties or masses of citizens. A nation acts at any one time through the consent and activity, not of all its members, but of only a majority, who determine what shall be done, not only for themselves, but for all the citizens. By our individual suffrages, we express our choice whether one class of citizens, with a peculiar policy and peculiar principles, shall rule the country directing it in a course of their own, or whether a different mass with different policy and principles shall conduct it in a different direction. I shall therefore discuss the existing parties freely. You shall judge whether I perform this duty with moderation and candor.

In the first place, I must ask you to notice the fact that society is now in a transition state or stage so far as political parties are con-

cerned. Two or three years ago, the American people were divided into two well defined, distinct and organized parties, the whigs and the democrats. To-day, instead of these two parties, we see three masses uncertainly defined, and apparently at least quite unorganized, namely, Americans, democrats and republicans; and we see portions of each of these easily detached and passing over to the others, while a very considerable number of citizens stand hesitating whether to join one or the other, or to stand aloof still longer from all.

Such a transition stage, although unusual, is not unnatural. Established parties are built on certain policies and principles, and they will stand and remain so long as those policies and principles are of paramount importance and no longer.

They must break asunder and dissolve when new exigencies bring up new and different policies and principles, and the transition stage will last until the paramount importance of these new policies and principles shall be generally felt and confessed, and no longer.

In a healthy and vigorous republic, the transition stage I have described cannot last long, because in the absence of a firm and decided majority to direct its course, its would fall under the management of feeble and corrupt factions, under whose sway it would rapidly decline, and speedily perish. Our republic, God be thanked, is yet healthy and vigorous, and we already see that society is passing out of the transition stage into the ancient and proper condition. This condition is one which tolerates two firm and enduring parties, no less and no more. There must be two parties, because at every stage of national life some one question of national conduct paramount to all others, presents itself to be decided. Such a question always has two sides, a right side and a wrong side, but no third or middle side. All masses which affect neutrality, as well as all masses which seek to stand independently on questions which have already passed and become obsolete, or on questions which have not yet attained paramount importance, are crowded and crushed in the conflicts between the two which occupy, for the time being, the whole field of contest.

If such an emergency has now occurred presenting a vital question, on which society must divide into two parties, and if those parties are found already present in the political arena, then we are now individually to decide whether to identify ourselves with a mass which will exist uselessly for only a short period, or unite with one

of two parties which will be enduring, and on the fortunes of whose conflict depends the welfare of the republic; and as between these parties whether we shall attach ourselves to the party which will maintain the wrong and perish with it, or to that which shall maintain the right and immediately or ultimately triumph with it.

You yourselves, shall prove by your responses that emergency has occurred, and that question is upon us. What has produced the disorganization and confusion which we have all seen and wondered at, the dissolution of the whig party, and the disorganization of the democratic party, and given room and verge for the American or know-nothing party? You all answer, the agitation of slavery. And you answer truly. Answer again. What shall I discourse upon? The contest of the American colonies with Great Britain, and the characters of the whigs and tories? No, that is a subject for the fourth of July. The adoption of the constitution, and the disputes between federalists and republicans? No, let them sleep. The tariff, National Bank and internal improvements, and the controversies of the whigs and democrats? No, they are past and gone. What then, of Kansas, the admission of Kansas as a free state or a slave state, the extension of slavery in the territories of the United States? Ah, yes, that is the theme, the extension of slavery, and nothing else. Now of what is it that the Americans in the north and in the south are debating in their councils, so far as their debates are suffered to transpire? The abrogation and restoration of the Missouri compromise and nothing else. The democrats also in the north and south, they speak of nothing else but saving the Union from destruction, by means of suppressing this very debate about the extension of slavery.

Is this question about the extension of slavery new, unreal, and imaginary, the mere illusion of an hour? Is it a wind that "bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth." No, it is an ancient and eternal conflict between two entirely antagonistic systems of human labor existing in American society, not unequal in their forces; a conflict for not merely toleration, but for absolute political sway in the republic, between the system of free labor with equal and universal suffrage, free speech free thought, and free action, and the system of slave labor with unequal franchises secured by arbitrary, oppressive and tyrannical laws. It is as old as the republic itself, although it has

never ripened before. It presented itself when the constitution was adopted, and was only temporarily repressed by a compromise which allowed to slaveholding communities three votes for every five slaves, while it provided at the same time for the abolition of the African slave trade. It presented itself in the continental congress of 1787, and was then put aside only by the passage of the ordinance of 1787, dedicating all the northwest territory to free labor. It occurred again in 1820, threatening to distract the Union, as was thought, and was then again put to rest by another compromise which relinquished Missouri to slave labor, and gave over the territory which now constitutes Kansas and Nebraska to free labor. It occurred again in 1844, when Texas was annexed and was put to sleep for only a short space by the division of Texas, very unequally indeed, into slave soil and free soil. It arose again during the war with Mexico, and was quieted by the memorable compromise of 1850, whose details I need not repeat. It occurred again in 1854, on the opening of Kansas and Nebraska territories to civilization, and was attempted to be put to sleep once more by the adoption in congress of the specious delusion of popular sovereignty. The question that is so old, has presented itself so often and never without disturbing, as it seemed, the very foundations of society, and that has deranged and disorganized all the political combinations of the country, fortified as they were by so many interests, ambitions, and traditions, must be confessed to be a real and enduring if not a vital question. But a moment's examination will serve to satisfy you that it is also a vital question. It is really one in which the parties are a sectional, local class of slaveholders, standing on the unnatural principle of property in human beings, on the one side, and the greater mass of society on the other, who, whether from choice or necessity, are not, cannot, and will not be either slaves or the owners of slaves.

It is a question between a small minority which cannot even maintain itself, except by means of continually increasing concessions and new and more liberal guarantees, and a majority that could never have been induced to grant even any guaranties except by threats of disunion and that can expect no return for new and further concessions and guaranties, but increasing exactions and ultimate aggressions or secessions. The slaveholders can never be content without dominion which abridges personal freedom as well

as circumscribes the domain of the non-slaveholding freemen. Non-slaveholding freemen can never permanently submit to such dominion. Nor can the competition or contention cease, for the reason that the general conscience of mankind throws its weight on the side of freedom and presses onward the resistants to oppose the solicitations and aggressions of the slaveholding class. Heretofore opposing political combinations long established, and firmly entrenched in traditions and popular affections, have concurred in the policy of suppressing this great and important question, but they have broken under its pressure at last. Henceforth, the antagonistical elements will be left to clash without hindrance. Heretofore the broad field of the national territories allowed each of the contending interests ample room without coming into direct conflict with the other. Henceforth, the two interests will be found contending for common ground claimed by both, and which can be occupied only by one of them.

One other condition remains to be settled, namely, that this great question is imminent and urgent; in other words, that it must be settled and determined without further postponement or delay. How can it be further postponed? If it could be postponed at all, it could be only by the same means which have been used successfully for that purpose heretofore, namely, compromise. Where are the agents for new compromises? The agents of the past compromises are gone. Although they sleep in honored graves, and the mourners over them have not yet quitted the streets, no new compromisers arise to occupy their places. A compromise involves mutual equivalents, something to give and something to take in exchange. Will slavery give you anything? No, it insists on a free right to all the territories. What have you to give in exchange? When you have given up Kansas, you will have relinquished all the territories, for the principle of the relinquishment is that slavery may constitutionally take them all. When compromise is exhausted, what follows? Dispute, contention, contest, conflict.

No! the question is imminent, and must be met now. Kansas, at the last session of congress, voluntarily offered itself as a free state, and demanded to be admitted into the Union, and was rejected. Since that time, the territory has been subjugated by slaveholders, and they having usurped its sovereignty, are organizing a slave state there which will apply for admission into the Union at the next

session of congress. Utah, already organized as a slave state, with her incestuous social system, is lying concealed and waiting, ready to demand admission so soon as Kansas shall have been received into the Union. The adoption of both, or even one, of these states will bear influentially, perhaps conclusively, on the fortunes of the entire conflict between freedom and slavery.

Insomuch as the question that is henceforth to divide society into two parties, is thus seen to be a vital and imminent one, let us fully possess ourselves of its magnitude. We have a sluggish, turbid and desolating stream of slave labor issuing from fifteen slave states. We have an ever increasing volume of free labor issuing from sixteen free states, swollen by a stream scarcely less full, from European and Asiatic fountains. These two variant floods cannot be mingled, but one necessarily repels and excludes the other. We have half a continent yet to be opened to the flow of the one or of the other. Shall we diffuse slavery over it to react upon and destroy ourselves, or shall we extend freedom over it covering it with happiness throughout all its mountains and plains, and thus forever establish our own safety and happiness?

If this great question were disembarrassed of all personal and partisan interests and prejudices, the universal voice of the American people would be pronounced for freedom and against slavery. Freedom is nothing more than equality of political right or power among all the members of a state. It is natural, just, useful and beneficent. All men instinctively choose the side on which these advantages lie. How true this is you may infer from the fact that every one of the banners borne to this field by one of the great contending masses wears as its inscription a tribute to freedom, while no banner borne by either of the other parties is ever defiled with homages to slavery.

Nevertheless, while all avow themselves favorable to freedom, we have to choose between the three political masses, the one which will effectually secure its predominance in the republic.

Shall we join ourselves to the know-nothing or American organization? What are its creed and its policy? Its creed is that the political franchises of alien immigrants and Roman catholics in our country are too great, and its policy is to abridge them.

Now I might for argument's sake concede that this creed and this policy are just and wise, still I could not unite with the know-

nothings even in that case, because their movement is out of season and out of place. The question of the day is not about natives and foreigners, nor about protestants and Roman catholics, but about freemen and slaves. The practical and immediately urgent question is, shall Kansas be admitted into the Union as a free state, or shall she be made a slave state and so admitted. What have the franchises of alien immigrants and Roman catholics to do with that? If the American people declare for freedom, Kansas will be free. If the American people declare for slavery, Kansas will be a slave state. If the American people divide and one portion, being a minority, declare for freedom; while another portion, being also a minority, declare against foreigners and catholics; and a third, larger than either, declare for slavery, nothing is obtained against foreigners and catholics, nothing against slavery, and yet Kansas becomes a slave state. Thus it is apparent that the issue raised by the know-nothings, whatever may be its merit, is an immaterial, irrelevant and false issue. A false issue always tends to divert and mislead the people from the true one, and of course to prejudice the judgment to be rendered upon it. I do not accuse the know-nothings of designing so to mislead, because, first, I know nothing of the motives of others; and, secondly, because the question is never upon motives but always upon effects. What have been the effects thus far? The know-nothing members of congress divided between the advocates of freedom in the territories and its opponents. Their votes combined with either party would have given it a complete triumph. Those votes reserved and cast as some peculiar interest dictated have left the question of freedom in Kansas to the ordeal of the sword in civil strife.

What is the effect upon the present canvass on which depends the question of the admission of Kansas and of Utah as slave states in the next congress? Distraction of the public mind. Such effects are inevitable. Whoever seeks to interpose an unreal or false issue must necessarily, in order to gain even a hearing, affect neutrality on the real one. At the same time no party can practice neutrality on a vital issue with fairness. It will necessarily sympathise with the weaker of the two contestants, and in some degree coöperate with it to overthrow the stronger, which is the common adversary of both. Of course, as the two great contestants exhibit unequal strength in different states, it will favor one in some of the states,

and favor the other in other states. By virtue of a law that is irresistible, it will sooner or later betray each party when its own peculiar ends require that course. The experience of the whig and democratic parties has proved how impossible it is to practise neutrality on the great question of slavery. The former has broken into pieces and perished in the effort. The latter has been crowded from a neutral position, and with crumbled ranks has taken that of the extension and fortification of slavery. The know-nothing mass can expect no better success. The effort will cost its life. Crowded and jostled between the two combatants, it will and must dissolve, giving up portions of its men here to freedom and there to slavery, but possibly not until it is too late to secure the triumph of freedom. Thus you see that the know-nothing mass is not really a political party. It is only an ephemeral and evanescent faction, as useless and as injurious as a third blade in the shears, or a third stone which an ignorant artizan might attempt to gear in between the upper and the nether millstone.

By another sign you shall know it to be not a party but a faction. From the day of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth until now, every one of the great parties which have been engaged in directing the life of the American people has recognized, from necessity, the political system which exists and which must continue to exist here as a republican one, based on the principles of the rightful political equality of all the members of the state, and has acted on the principle that directness, publicity and equality of voices are necessary in the conduct of public affairs. The know-nothings reject these principles, and seek to exclude a large and considerable portion of the members of the state from all participation in the conduct of its affairs, and to obtain control and carry on the operations of the government of all by secret machinery inconsistent with the constitution of a republic, and appropriate only to a conspiracy either for or against despotism. It will, I think, be hereafter regarded as one of the caprices of politics that a system of combination so puerile was ever attempted in the United States. The absurdity of the attempt is rendered still more glaring when it is considered that the grounds of persecution assumed against the class to be excluded are those of nativity and religious belief—grounds directly in conflict with that elementary truth announced by the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, and are by nature endowed with cer-

tain inalienable rights, to secure which governments are instituted among men; and with that fundamental article of the constitution which declares that no system of religion shall ever be established.

Who, then, will choose to enroll himself under the banner of an ephemeral, evanescent and injurious faction like this, to be compromised in its frauds for a day or a year, or two years, and then to be left by it to the pity and scorn of the nation whose confidence it had sought to abuse? Certainly, no one who values at its just worth the great interests of freedom and humanity, which are staked on the present contest, nor even any one who values at its just worth his own influence, or even his own vote, or his own character as a citizen.

Our choice between parties, fellow citizens, is thus confined to the democratic and republican parties. On what principle could we attach ourselves to the democratic party? Let us look full in the face the actual state of things. Seven years ago, when I entered congress as a senator from this state, there was not one acre of soil within the national domain from which slavery was not excluded by law. It was excluded from Minnesota by the ordinance of 1787, which was then of fully acknowledged obligation and effect. It was excluded from Kansas and Nebraska by the Missouri compromise restriction, which also was then in full effect. It was equally excluded from California, including New Mexico and Utah, by Mexican laws which had never been impaired, and were of confessed obligation.

It was excluded from Oregon by the organic law of that territory. *Now* there is not an acre of the public domain which congress has not opened to the entrance of slavery. It has expressly abrogated the Missouri compromise, on the ground that it was void, for want of power in congress under the constitution to exclude slavery, and also on the ground that the compromise of 1850 had already settled its invalidity. This legislation, if acquiesced in by the people, and so confirmed, will henceforth be irresistibly claimed as abrogating alike the ordinance of 1787, the Missouri compromise restriction, and the organic law of Oregon, and the Mexican laws. Thus the whole of the territories has been already lost to freedom by the legislation of the last seven years; and the controversy before us is one not to save, but to reclaim. During the first six years of that period, there were only two parties—the democratic and the whig parties—in congress and in the country. During the last year there were three, the democratic, know-nothing and republican parties. Every one

will at once acquit the republican party, and those who now constitute it, of all agency in the betrayal and surrender of freedom which have thus been made. The responsibility for them, therefore, belongs to the democratic party and to the whig party. Now you may divide this responsibility between the democratic and whig parties, just as you like. The whig party has perished under its weight, but a still greater responsibility lies upon the democratic party. It was the democratic party that refused to admit California, without condition or compromise, in 1850; that forced on the whig party the compromise of that year, and adopted it as its own permanent policy, and elected Franklin Pierce the present president of the United States. It was the democratic party that invented the new, plausible, deceptive and ruinous policy of abnegation of federal authority over slavery in the territories, and the substitution of the theory of popular sovereignty; and it was the democratic party that, with the coöperation of a portion of the know-nothings, rejected the appeal of oppressed and subjugated Kansas for relief and restoration to freedom, by admission into the Union as a free state. The democratic party did, indeed, in some of its conventions in northern states, for a time hesitate to commit itself to the policy of slavery propagandism by breach of public faith, fraud and force, but it has finally renounced all resistance, and it now stands boldly forth, avowing its entire approval of that odious and ruinous determination to carry it to its end, whatever that end may be.

Nor will any candid person claim that anything better is to be hoped from the democratic party in the future. It is a party essentially built on the interest of the slaveholding class. Deprived of that support, it would instantly cease to exist. The principle of this class is, that property in man is sanctioned by the constitution of the United States and is inviolate. All that has been won by this class from freedom, has been won on that principle. The decisions of Judge Kane and other federal judges, and the odious and tyrannical laws of the usurpers in Kansas, are legitimate fruits of that principle. To that principle the democratic party must adhere or perish, and it accepts it as the least fearful of two alternatives. But the principle, when established in the territories, will then be with equal plausibility extended to the states, and thenceforward we are to contend for the right of the free states to exclude slavery within their own borders.

If these arguments be sound, we are shut up to the necessity of giving our support to the republican party, as the only means of maintaining the cause of freedom and humanity. Why, then, shall we stand aloof from it, in this election, or for a day or an hour? I will review the argument urged from all quarters, and you shall see in the first place that every one of them is frivolous and puerile; and, secondly, that it involves nothing less than a surrender of the entire question in issue, and acquiescence in the unrestricted domination of slavery.

First: We are conjured by those who, in Boston, New York and elsewhere, call themselves straight-out whigs, to wait for a reörganization of the national whig party, to rescue the cause of freedom. But is it written in any book of political revelation that a resurrection on this earth awaits parties which have fulfilled the course of nature?

Secondly: The whig party perished through a lack of virtue to maintain the cause of freedom. Amongst all of those who are waiting and praying for its resurrection, there is not one that to-day yields his support to that cause. What, then, but new betrayals can be expected, if it is destined to a resurrection?

We are told on all sides that the republican party is new and partially organized, and merely experimental. It is, indeed, new, and as yet imperfectly organized. But so once was the ancient whig party, that gave to the country independence. So once was the federal party, that gave to the country its constitution. So once was the ancient republican party, that gave to the country a complete emancipation of the masses from the combination of classes. So once was the whig and the democratic party. It is the destiny of associations of men to have a beginning and an end. If an association is born of an enduring political necessity, it will endure and wax in vigor and power until it supplants other and superfluous, though more aged combinations. That such is to be the case with the republican party, is seen in the fact that all existing combinations are now uniting against it, on the ground that such a union is necessary to prevent its immediate and overwhelming ascendancy. This union is an effective answer to the former argument, that the republican party is an ephemeral and evanescent one.

Thirdly: We are favored with criticisms by the democrats and know-nothings on the course of the republican members of the house

of representatives, by voting for Mr. Dunn's bill to restore the Missouri compromise, and against Mr. Toombs' bill, for pacifying Kansas, which votes, it is said, prove the republicans insincere in their devotion to freedom. These are the same class of arguments with those which are urged by infidels against the Christian church, on the ground of the short-comings of its members.

Suppose we abandon the republican party for its short-comings, will freedom then have any party left? and if so, what party, and where shall we find it? Certainly no other party but the democratic party, of which Franklin Pierce and Stephen A. Douglas are the apostles. But that is the party of slavery.

Fellow citizens, I have discussed parties with no asperity and with no partiality, for I know that masses and individuals are alike honest well meaning and patriotic. I have no animosities and no griefs. While I have tried to pursue always that one steady course which my conscience has approved, my friends have often been alienated, and adversaries have become friends. The charity of judgment, to which I feel that I am entitled—that is the charity I extend to others.

I do not predict the times and seasons when one or other of the contending political elements shall prevail. I know, nevertheless, that this state, this nation, and this earth are to be the abode and happy home of freemen. Its hills and valleys are to be fields of free labor, free thought and free suffrages. That consummation will come when society is prepared for it. My labors are devoted to that preparation. I leave others to cling to obsolete traditions and decaying systems, and perish with them if they must; but in politics, as in religion, I desire for myself to be always with that portion of my fellow men who hold fast to the truth, with hope and confidence enduring through all trials in its complete and eternal triumph.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

ROCHESTER, OCTOBER 25, 1858.

THE unmistakable outbreaks of zeal which occur all around me, show that you are earnest men—and such a man am I. Let us therefore, at least for a time, pass by all secondary and collateral questions, whether of a personal or of a general nature, and consider the main subject of the present canvass. The democratic party—or, to speak more accurately, the party which wears that attractive name—is in possession of the federal government. The republicans propose to dislodge that party, and dismiss it from its high trust.

The main subject, then, is, whether the democratic party deserves to retain the confidence of the American people. In attempting to prove it unworthy, I think that I am not actuated by prejudices against that party, or by prepossessions in favor of its adversary; for I have learned, by some experience, that virtue and patriotism, vice and selfishness, are found in all parties, and that they differ less in their motives than in the policies they pursue.

Our country is a theatre, which exhibits, in full operation, two radically different political systems; the one resting on the basis of servile or slave labor, the other on the basis of voluntary labor of freemen.

The laborers who are enslaved are all negroes, or persons more or less purely of African derivation. But this is only accidental. The principle of the system is, that labor in every society, by whomsoever performed, is necessarily unintellectual, groveling and base; and that the laborer, equally for his own good and for the welfare of the state, ought to be enslaved The white laboring man, whether native or foreigner, is not enslaved, only because he cannot, as yet, be reduced to bondage.

You need not be told now that the slave system is the older of the two, and that once it was universal.

The emancipation of our own ancestors, Caucasians and Europeans as they were, hardly dates beyond a period of five hundred years. The great melioration of human society which modern times exhibit, is mainly due to the incomplete substitution of the system of voluntary labor for the old one of servile labor, which has already taken place. This African slave system is one which, in its origin and in its growth, has been altogether foreign from the habits of the races which colonized these states, and established civilization here. It was introduced on this new continent as an engine of conquest, and for the establishment of monarchical power, by the Portuguese and the Spaniards, and was rapidly extended by them all over South America, Central America, Louisiana and Mexico. Its legitimate fruits are seen in the poverty, imbecility, and anarchy, which now pervade all Portuguese and Spanish America. The free-labor system is of German extraction, and it was established in our country by emigrants from Sweden, Holland, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland.

We justly ascribe to its influences the strength, wealth, greatness, intelligence, and freedom, which the whole American people now enjoy. One of the chief elements of the value of human life is freedom in the pursuit of happiness. The slave system is not only intolerable, unjust, and inhuman, towards the laborer, whom, only because he is a laborer, it loads down with chains and converts into merchandise, but is scarcely less severe upon the freeman, to whom, only because he is a laborer from necessity, it denies facilities for employment, and whom it expels from the community because it cannot enslave and convert him into merchandise also. It is necessarily improvident and ruinous, because, as a general truth, communities prosper and flourish or droop and decline in just the degree that they practise or neglect to practise the primary duties of justice and humanity. The free-labor system conforms to the divine law of equality, which is written in the hearts and consciences of man, and therefore is always and everywhere beneficent.

The slave system is one of constant danger, distrust, suspicion, and watchfulness. It debases those whose toil alone can produce wealth and resources for defense, to the lowest degree of which human nature is capable, to guard against mutiny and insurrection, and thus wastes energies which otherwise might be employed in national development and aggrandizement.

The free-labor system educates all alike, and by opening all the fields of industrial employment, and all the departments of authority, to the unchecked and equal rivalry of all classes of men, at once secures universal contentment, and brings into the highest possible activity all the physical, moral and social energies of the whole state. In states where the slave system prevails, the masters, directly or indirectly, secure all political power, and constitute a ruling aristocracy. In states where the free-labor system prevails, universal suffrage necessarily obtains, and the state inevitably becomes, sooner or later, a republic or democracy.

Russia yet maintains slavery, and is a despotism. Most of the other European states have abolished slavery, and adopted the system of free labor. It was the antagonistic political tendencies of the two systems which the first Napoleon was contemplating when he predicted that Europe would ultimately be either all Cossack or all republican. Never did human sagacity utter a more pregnant truth. The two systems are at once perceived to be incongruous. But they are more than incongruous—they are incompatible. They never have permanently existed together in one country, and they never can. It would be easy to demonstrate this impossibility, from the irreconcilable contrast between their great principles and characteristics. But the experience of mankind has conclusively established it. Slavery, as I have already intimated, existed in every state in Europe. Free labor has supplanted it everywhere except in Russia and Turkey. State necessities developed in modern times, are now obliging even those two nations to encourage and employ free labor; and already, despotic as they are, we find them engaged in abolishing slavery. In the United States, slavery came into collision with free labor at the close of the last century, and fell before it in New England, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, but triumphed over it effectually, and excluded it for a period yet undetermined, from Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia. Indeed, so incompatible are the two systems, that every new state which is organized within our ever extending domain makes its first political act a choice of the one and the exclusion of the other, even at the cost of civil war, if necessary. The slave states, without law, at the last national election, successfully forbade, within their own limits, even the casting of votes for a candidate for president of the United States supposed to be favorable to the establishment of the free-labor system in new states.

Hitherto, the two systems have existed in different states, but side by side within the American Union. This has happened because the Union is a confederation of states. But in another aspect the United States constitute only one nation. Increase of population, which is filling the states out to their very borders, together with a new and extended net-work of railroads and other avenues, and an internal commerce which daily becomes more intimate, is rapidly bringing the states into a higher and more perfect social unity or consolidation. Thus, these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results.

Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation. Either the cotton and rice-fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye-fields and wheat-fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free states, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, vain and ephemeral. Startling as this saying may appear to you, fellow citizens, it is by no means an original or even a moderate one. Our forefathers knew it to be true, and unanimously acted upon it when they framed the constitution of the United States. They regarded the existence of the servile system in so many of the states with sorrow and shame, which they openly confessed, and they looked upon the collision between them, which was then just revealing itself, and which we are now accustomed to deplore, with favor and hope. They knew that either the one or the other system must exclusively prevail.

Unlike too many of those who in modern time invoke their authority, they had a choice between the two. They preferred the system of free labor, and they determined to organize the government, and

so to direct its activity, that that system should surely and certainly prevail. For this purpose, and no other, they based the whole structure of government broadly on the principle that all men are created equal, and therefore free—little dreaming that, within the short period of one hundred years, their descendants would bear to be told by any orator, however popular, that the utterance of that principle was merely a rhetorical rhapsody; or by any judge, however venerated, that it was attended by mental reservations, which rendered it hypocritical and false. By the ordinance of 1787, they dedicated all of the national domain not yet polluted by slavery to free labor immediately, thenceforth and forever; while by the new constitution and laws they invited foreign free labor from all lands under the sun, and interdicted the importation of African slave labor, at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances whatsoever. It is true that they necessarily and wisely modified this policy of freedom, by leaving it to the several states, affected as they were by differing circumstances, to abolish slavery in their own way and at their own pleasure, instead of confiding that duty to congress; and that they secured to the slave states, while yet retaining the system of slavery, a three-fifths representation of slaves in the federal government, until they should find themselves able to relinquish it with safety. But the very nature of these modifications fortifies my position that the fathers knew that the two systems could not endure within the Union, and expected that within a short period slavery would disappear forever. Moreover, in order that these modifications might not altogether defeat their grand design of a republic maintaining universal equality, they provided that two-thirds of the states might amend the constitution.

It remains to say on this point only one word, to guard against misapprehension. If these states are to again become universally slaveholding, I do not pretend to say with what violations of the constitution that end shall be accomplished. On the other hand, while I do confidently believe and hope that my country will yet become a land of universal freedom, I do not expect that it will be made so otherwise than through the action of the several states coöperating with the federal government, and all acting in strict conformity with their respective constitutions.

The strife and contentions concerning slavery, which gently-disposed persons so habitually deprecate, are nothing more than the

ripening of the conflict which the fathers themselves not only thus regarded with favor, but which they may be said to have instituted.

It is not to be denied, however, that thus far the course of that contest has not been according to their humane anticipations and wishes. In the field of federal politics, slavery, deriving unlooked-for advantages from commercial changes, and energies unforeseen from the facilities of combination between members of the slaveholding class and between that class and other property classes, early rallied, and has at length made a stand, not merely to retain its original defensive position, but to extend its sway throughout the whole Union. It is certain that the slaveholding class of American citizens indulge this high ambition, and that they derive encouragement for it from the rapid and effective political successes which they have already obtained. The plan of operation is this: By continued appliances of patronage and threats of disunion, they will keep a majority favorable to these designs in the senate, where each state has an equal representation. Through that majority they will defeat, as they best can, the admission of free states and secure the admission of slave states. Under the protection of the judiciary, they will, on the principle of the Dred Scott case, carry slavery into all the territories of the United States now existing and hereafter to be organized. By the action of the president and the senate, using the treaty-making power, they will annex foreign slaveholding states. In a favorable conjuncture they will induce congress to repeal the act of 1808, which prohibits the foreign slave trade, and so they will import from Africa, at the cost of only twenty dollars a head, slaves enough to fill up the interior of the continent. Thus relatively increasing the number of slave states, they will allow no amendment to the constitution prejudicial to their interest; and so, having permanently established their power, they expect the federal judiciary to nullify all state laws which shall interfere with internal or foreign commerce in slaves. When the free states shall be sufficiently demoralized to tolerate these designs, they reasonably conclude that slavery will be accepted by those states themselves. I shall not stop to show how speedy or how complete would be the ruin which the accomplishment of these slaveholding schemes would bring upon the country. For one, I should not remain in the country to test the sad experiment. Having spent my manhood, though not my whole life, n a free state, no aristocracy of any kind, much less an aristocracy

of slaveholders, shall ever make the laws of the land in which I shall be content to live. Having seen the society around me universally engaged in agriculture, manufactures and trade, which were innocent and beneficent, I shall never be a denizen of a state where men and women are reared as cattle, and bought and sold as merchandise. When that evil day shall come, and all further effort at resistance shall be impossible, then, if there shall be no better hope for redemption than I can now foresee, I shall say with Franklin, while looking abroad over the whole earth for a new and more congenial home, "Where liberty dwells, there is my country."

You will tell me that these fears are extravagant and chimerical. I answer, they are so; but they are so only because the designs of the slaveholders must and can be defeated. But it is only the possibility of defeat that renders them so. They cannot be defeated by inactivity. There is no escape from them, compatible with non-resistance. How, then, and in what way, shall the necessary resistance be made. There is only one way. The democratic party must be permanently dislodged from the government. The reason is, that the democratic party is inextricably committed to the designs of the slaveholders, which I have described. Let me be well understood. I do not charge that the democratic candidates for public office now before the people are pledged to—much less that the democratic masses who support them really adopt—those atrocious and dangerous designs. Candidates may, and generally do, mean to act justly, wisely and patriotically, when they shall be elected; but they become the ministers and servants, not the dictators, of the power which elects them. The policy which a party shall pursue at a future period is only gradually developed, depending on the occurrence of events never fully foreknown. The motives of men, whether acting as electors or in any other capacity, are generally pure. Nevertheless, it is not more true that "hell is paved with good intentions," than it is that earth is covered with wrecks resulting from innocent and amiable motives.

The very constitution of the democratic party commits it to execute all the designs of the slaveholders, whatever they may be. It is not a party of the whole Union, of all the free states and of all the slave states; nor yet is it a party of the free states in the north and in the northwest; but it is a sectional and local party, having

practically its seat within the slave states, and counting its constituency chiefly and almost exclusively there. Of all its representatives in congress and in the electoral colleges, two-thirds uniformly come from these states. Its great element of strength lies in the vote of the slaveholders, augmented by the representation of three-fifths of the slaves. Deprive the democratic party of this strength, and it would be a helpless and hopeless minority, incapable of continued organization. The democratic party, being thus local and sectional, acquires new strength from the admission of every new slave state, and loses relatively by the admission of every new free state into the Union.

A party is in one sense a joint stock association, in which those who contribute most direct the action and management of the concern. The slaveholders contributing in an overwhelming proportion to the capital strength of the democratic party, they necessarily dictate and prescribe its policy. The inevitable caucus system enables them to do so with a show of fairness and justice. If it were possible to conceive for a moment that the democratic party should disobey the behests of the slaveholders, we should then see a withdrawal of the slaveholders, which would leave the party to perish. The portion of the party which is found in the free states is a mere appendage, convenient to modify its sectional character, without impairing its sectional constitution, and is less effective in regulating its movement than the nebulous tail of the comet is in determining the appointed though apparently eccentric course of the fiery sphere from which it emanates.

To expect the democratic party to resist slavery and favor freedom, is as unreasonable as to look for protestant missionaries to the catholic propaganda of Rome. The history of the democratic party commits it to the policy of slavery. It has been the democratic party, and no other agency, which has carried that policy up to its present alarming culmination. Without stopping to ascertain, critically, the origin of the present democratic party, we may concede its claim to date from the era of good feeling which occurred under the administration of President Monroe. At that time, in this state, and about that time in many others of the free states, the democratic party deliberately disfranchised the free colored or African citizen, and it has pertinaciously continued this disfranchisement ever since. This was an effective aid to slavery; for, while the slaveholder votes

for his slaves against freedom, the freed slave in the free states is prohibited from voting against slavery.

In 1824, the democracy resisted the election of John Quincy Adams—himself before that time an acceptable democrat—and in 1828 it expelled him from the presidency and put a slaveholder in his place, although the office had been filled by slaveholders thirty-two out of forty years.

In 1836, Martin Van Buren—the first non-slaveholding citizen of a free state to whose election the democratic party ever consented—signalized his inauguration into the presidency by a gratuitous announcement, that under no circumstances would he ever approve a bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. From 1838 to 1844, the subject of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia and in the national dock-yards and arsenals, was brought before congress by repeated popular appeals. The democratic party thereupon promptly denied the right of petition, and effectually suppressed the freedom of speech in congress, so far as the institution of slavery was concerned.

From 1840 to 1843, good and wise men counseled that Texas should remain outside the Union until she should consent to relinquish her self instituted slavery; but the democratic party precipitated her admission into the Union, not only without that condition, but even with a covenant that the state might be divided and reörganized so as to constitute four slave states instead of one.

In 1846, when the United States became involved in a war with Mexico, and it was apparent that the struggle would end in the dismemberment of that republic, which was a non-slaveholding power, the democratic party rejected a declaration that slavery should not be established within the territory to be acquired. When, in 1850, governments were to be instituted in the territories of California and New Mexico, the fruits of that war, the democratic party refused to admit New Mexico as a free state, and only consented to admit California as a free state on the condition, as it has since explained the transaction, of leaving all of New Mexico and Utah open to slavery, to which was also added the concession of perpetual slavery in the District of Columbia, and the passage of an unconstitutional, cruel and humiliating law, for the recapture of fugitive slaves, with a further stipulation that the subject of slavery should never again be agitated in either chamber of congress. When, in 1854, the slaveholders

were contentedly reposing on these great advantages, then so recently won, the democratic party unnecessarily, officiously and with superserviceable liberality, awakened them from their slumber, to offer and force on their acceptance the abrogation of the law which declared that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude should ever exist within that part of the ancient territory of Louisiana which lay outside of the state of Missouri, and north of the parallel of 36° 30′ of north latitude—a law which, with the exception of one other, was the only statute of freedom then remaining in the federal code.

In 1856, when the people of Kansas had organized a new state within the region thus abandoned to slavery, and applied to be admitted as a free state into the Union, the democratic party contemptuously rejected their petition, and drove them with menaces and intimidations from the halls of congress, and armed the president with military power to enforce their submission to a slave code, established over them by fraud and usurpation. At every subsequent stage of the long contest which has since raged in Kansas, the democratic party has lent its sympathies, its aid, and all the powers of the government which it controlled, to enforce slavery upon that unwilling and injured people. And now, even at this day, while it mocks us with the assurance that Kansas is free, the democratic party keeps the state excluded from her just and proper place in the Union, under the hope that she may be dragooned into the acceptance of slavery.

The democratic party, finally, has procured from a supreme judiciary, fixed in its interest, a decree that slavery exists by force of the constitution in every territory of the United States, paramount to all legislative authority, either within the territory, or residing in congress.

Such is the democratic party. It has no policy, state or federal, for finance, or trade, or manufacture, or commerce, or education, or internal improvements, or for the protection or even the security of civil or religious liberty. It is positive and uncompromising in the interest of slavery—negative, compromising, and vacillating, in regard to everything else. It boasts its love of equality, and wastes its strength, and even its life, in fortifying the only aristocracy known in the land. It professes fraternity, and, so often as slavery requires, allies itself with proscription. It magnifies itself for con-

quests in foreign lands, but it sends the national eagle forth always with chains, and not the olive branch, in his fangs.

This dark record shows you, fellow citizens, what I was unwilling to announce at an earlier stage of this argument, that of the whole nefarious schedule of slaveholding designs which I have submitted to you, the democratic party has left only one yet to be consummated—the abrogation of the law which forbids the African slave trade.

Now, I know very well that the democratic party has, at every stage of these proceedings, disavowed the motive and the policy of fortifying and extending slavery, and has excused them on entirely different and more plausible grounds. But the inconsistency and frivolity of these pleas prove still more conclusively the guilt I charge upon that party. It must, indeed, try to excuse such guilt before mankind, and even to the consciences of its own adherents. There is an instinctive abhorrence of slavery, and an inborn and inhering love of freedom in the human heart, which render palliation of such gross misconduct indispensable. It disfranchised the free African on the ground of a fear that, if left to enjoy the right of suffrage, he might seduce the free white citizens into amalgamation with his wronged and despised race. The democratic party condemned and deposed John Quincy Adams, because he expended twelve millions a year, while it justifies his favored successor in spending seventy, eighty and even one hundred millions, a year. It denies emancipation in the District of Columbia, even with compensation to masters and the consent of the people, on the ground of an implied constitutional inhibition, although the constitution expressly confers upon congress sovereign legislative power in that district, and although the democratic party is tenacious of the principle of strict construction. It violated the express provisions of the constitution in suppressing petition and debate on the subject of slavery, through fear of disturbance of the public harmony, although it claims that the electors have a right to instruct their representatives, and even demand their resignation in cases of contumacy. It extended slavery over Texas, and connived at the attempt to spread it across the Mexican territories, even to the shores of the Pacific ocean, under a plea of enlarging the area of freedom. It abrogated the Mexican slave law and the Missouri compromise prohibition of slavery in Kansas, not to open the new territories to slavery, but to try therein the new and fascinating theories of non-intervention and popular sovereignty;

and, finally, it overthrew both these new and elegant systems by the English Lecompton bill and the Dred Scott decision, on the ground that the free states ought not to enter the Union without a population equal to the representative basis of one member of congress, although slave states might come in without inspection as to their numbers.

Will any member of the democratic party now here claim that the authorities chosen by the suffrages of the party transcended their partisan platforms, and so misrepresented the party in the various transactions, I have recited? Then I ask him to name one democratic statesman or legislator, from Van Buren to Walker, who, either timidly or cautiously like them, or boldly and defiantly like Douglas, ever refused to execute a behest of the slaveholders and was not therefor, and for no other cause, immediately denounced, and deposed from his trust, and repudiated by the democratic party for that contumacy.

I think, fellow citizens, that I have shown you that it is high time for the friends of freedom to rush to the rescue of the constitution, and that their very first duty is to dismiss the democratic party from the administration of the government.

Why shall it not be done? All agree that it ought to be done. What, then, shall prevent its being done? Nothing but timidity or division of the opponents of the democratic party.

Some of these opponents start one objection, and some another. Let us notice these objections briefly. One class say that they cannot trust the republican party; that it has not avowed its hostility to slavery boldly enough, or its affection for freedom earnestly enough.

I ask, in reply, is there any other party which can be more safely trusted? Every one knows that it is the republican party, or none, that shall displace the democratic party. But I answer, further, that the character and fidelity of any party are determined, necessarily, not by its pledges, programmes, and platforms, but by the public exigencies, and the temper of the people when they call it into activity. Subserviency to slavery is a law written not only on the forehead of the democratic party, but also in its very soul—so resistance to slavery, and devotion to freedom, the popular elements now actively working for the republican party among the people, must and will be the resources for its ever-renewing strength and constant invigoration.

Others cannot support the republican party, because it has not sufficiently exposed its platform, and determined what it will do, and what it will not do, when triumphant. It may prove too progressive for some, and too conservative for others. As if any party ever foresaw so clearly the course of future events as to plan a universal scheme of future action, adapted to all possible emergencies. Who would ever have joined even the whig party of the revolution, if it had been obliged to answer, in 1775, whether it would declare for independence in 1776, and for this noble federal constitution of ours in 1787, and not a year earlier or later? The people will be as wise next year, and even ten years hence, as we are now. They will oblige the republican party to act as the public welfare and the interests of justice and humanity shall require, through all the stages of its career, whether of trial or triumph.

Others will not venture an effort, because they fear that the Union would not endure the change. Will such objectors tell me how long a constitution can bear a strain directly along the fibres of which it is composed? This is a constitution of freedom. It is being converted into a constitution of slavery. It is a republican constitution. It is being made an aristocratic one. Others wish to wait until some collateral questions concerning temperance, or the exercise of the elective franchise are properly settled. Let me ask all such persons, whether time enough has not been wasted on these points already, without gaining any other than this single advantage, namely, the discovery that only one thing can be effectually done at one time, and that the one thing which must and will be done at any one time is just that thing which is most urgent, and will no longer admit of postponement or delay. Finally, we are told by faint-hearted men that they despond; the democratic party, they say is unconquerable, and the dominion of slavery is consequently inevitable. I reply that the complete and universal dominion of slavery would be intolerable enough, when it should have come, after the last possible effort to escape should have been made. There would then be left to us the consoling reflection of fidelity to duty.

But I reply further, that I know—few, I think, know better than I—the resources and energies of the democratic party, which is identical with the slave power. I do ample prestige to its traditional popularity. I know, further—few, I think, know better than I—the difficulties and disadvantages of organizing a new political force,

like the republican party, and the obstacles it must encounter in laboring without prestige and without patronage. But, understanding all this, I know that the democratic party must go down, and that the republican party must rise into its place. The democratic party derived its strength, originally, from its adoption of the principles of equal and exact justice to all men. So long as it practised this principle faithfully, it was invulnerable. It became vulnerable when it renounced the principle, and since that time it has maintained itself, not by virtue of its own strength, or even of its traditional merits, but because there as yet had appeared in the political field no other party that had the conscience and the courage to take up, and avow, and practice the life-inspiring principle which the democratic party had surrendered. At last, the republican party has appeared. It avows, now, as the republican party of 1800 did, in one word, its faith and its works, "Equal and exact justice to all men." Even when it first entered the field, only half organized, it struck a blow which only just failed to secure complete and triumphant victory. In this, its second campaign, it has already won advantages which render that triumph now both easy and certain.

The secret of its assured success lies in that very characteristic which, in the mouth of scoffers, constitutes its great and lasting imbecility and reproach. It lies in the fact that it is a party of one idea; but that idea is a noble one—an idea that fills and expands all generous souls; the idea of equality—the equality of all men before human tribunals and human laws, as they all are equal before the Divine tribunal and Divine laws.

I know, and you know, that a revolution has begun. I know, and all the world knows, that revolutions never go backward. Twenty senators and a hundred representatives proclaim boldly in congress to-day sentiments and opinions and principles of freedom which hardly so many men, even in this free state, dared to utter in their own homes twenty years ago. While the government of the United States, under the conduct of the democratic party, has been all that time surrendering one plain and castle after another to slavery, the people of the United States have been no less steadily and perseveringly gathering together the forces with which to recover back again all the fields and all the castles which have been lost, and to confound and overthrow, by one decisive blow, the betrayers of the constitution and freedom forever.

THE NATIONAL DIVERGENCE AND RETURN.[1]

DETROIT, SEPTEMBER 4, 1860.

WE claim that our political system is a judicious one, and that we are an intelligent and virtuous people. The government ought, therefore, not only to secure respect and good will abroad, but also to produce good order, contentment and harmony at home. It fails to attain these ends. The Canadians certainly neither envy nor love us. All the independent American powers, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, while they strive to construct governments for themselves after our models, fear, and many of them hate us. European nations do indeed revere our constitutions and admire our progress, but they generally agree in pronouncing us inconsistent with our organic principle, and capricious. The president inveighs against corruption among the people. The immediate representatives of the people in congress charge the president with immoral practices, and the president protests against their action as subversive of the executive prerogative. The house of representatives organizes itself convulsively amid confessed dangers of popular commotion. The senate listens unsurprised, and almost without excitement, to menaces of violence, secession and disunion. Frauds and violence in the territories are palliated and rewarded. Exposure and resistance to them are condemned and punished, while the just, enlightened and reasonable will of the people there, though constitutionally expressed, is circumvented, disobeyed and disregarded. States watch anxiously for unlawful intrusion and invasion by citizens of other states, while the federal courts fail to suppress piracies on the high seas, and even on our own coasts. The government of the Union courts and submits to state espionage of the federal mails, while the states scarcely attempt to protect the personal rights of citizens of other states,

1 This speech and the six following, were made by Mr. Seward during his tour through Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Kansas, and came to be known as his "western speeches." See Memoir, *ante*, page 54.

peacefully pursuing harmless occupations within their fraternal jurisdictions.

Are the people satisfied and content? Let their several parties and masses answer. Certainly you, the republicans of Michigan, as well as the republicans throughout the whole country, are not satisfied. But you are interested in a change of administration, and therefore perhaps prejudiced. Ask, then, the constitutional Union men, few and inefficient indeed here, but numerous and energetic elsewhere. They are not satisfied. If they were they would not be engaged, as they are now, in a hopeless attempt to organize a new party without any principles at all, after their recent failures to combine such a party on obnoxious principles. But they also are interested and possibly prejudiced like the republicans. Appeal, then, to the democratic party, which enjoys and wields the patronage and power of the federal government. Even the democrats are no less dissatisfied. They certainly are dissatisfied with the republicans, with the national Union men, with their own administration, with each other, and as I think even individually, with themselves. The north is not satisfied. Its masses want a suppression of the African slave trade, and an effectual exclusion of slavery from the territories, so that all the new and future states may surely be free states. The south is not satisfied. Its masses, by whatever means and at whatever cost, desire the establishment and protection of slavery in the territories, so that none of the new states may fail to become slave states. The east is discontented with the neglect of its fishery, manufacture and navigation, and the west is impatient under the operation of a national policy, hostile to its agricultural, mining and social developments. What government in the world but ours has persistently refused to improve rivers, construct harbors and establish light houses for the protection of its commerce? New and anomalous combinations of citizens appear in the north, justifying armed instigators of civil and servile war, in the south devising means for the disruption and dismemberment of the Union. It is manifest that we are suffering in the respect and confidence of foreign states, and that disorder and confusion are more flagrant among ourselves now than ever before.

I do not intend to be understood that these evils are thus far productive of material suffering or intolerable embarrassment, much less that the country is, as so many extravagant persons say, on the high

road to civil war or dissolution. On the contrary, this fair land we live in is so blessed with all the elements of human comfort and happiness, and its citizens are at once so loyal and wise, and so well surrounded by yet unbroken guaranties of civil and religious liberty, that our experience of misrule at the very worst, never becomes so painful as to raise the question, how much more of public misery we can endure; but it leaves us at liberty to stop now, as always heretofore, with the inquiry, how much more of freedom, prosperity and honor we can secure by the practice of greater wisdom and higher virtue? Discontentment is the wholesome fruit of a discovery of maladministration, and conviction of public error is here at least always a sure harbinger of political reform.

Martin Van Buren, they say, is writing a review of his own life, and our time, for posthumous uses. If it is not disrespectful, I should like to know now the conclusions he draws from the national events he has seen, and of which he has been an important part; for he is a shrewd observer, with advantages of large and long experience. To me it seems that the last forty years have constituted a period of signal and lamentable failure in the efforts of statesmen to adjust and establish a federal policy for the regulation of the subject of slavery in its relations to the Union. In this view I regard it as belonging to the office of a statesman not merely to favor an immediate and temporary increase of national wealth, and an enlargement of national territory, but also to fortify, so far as the prescribed constitutional limits of his action may allow, the influences of knowledge and humanity; to abate popular prejudices and passions, by modifying or removing their causes; to ascertain and disclose the operation of general laws, and to study and reveal the social tendencies of the age, and by combining the past with the present, while giving free play all the time to the reciprocating action of the many coëxisting moral forces, to develop that harmonious system which actually prevails in the apparent chaos of human affairs; and so to gain something in the way of assurance as to the complexion of that futurity toward which, since our country is destined to endure, and insomuch as we desire that it may be immortal, our thoughts are so vehemently driven even by the selfish as well as by the generous principles of our nature.

I have understood that John Quincy Adams, the purest and wisest statesman I ever knew, died despairing of a peaceful solution of the

problem of slavery, on which he was so intently engaged throughout his public service. If we may judge from the absolute failures of Mr. Van Buren, Mr. Polk, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Buchanan, in the respect I have mentioned, and if we take into consideration also the systems which Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Benton, Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster severally recommended, and which have subsequently failed to be adopted, we may perhaps conclude that the difficulties of establishing a satisfactory and soothing policy, have overtasked even our wisest and most eminent statesmen. They certainly have been neither incapable nor selfish men. No age or country has been illustrated by public characters of greater genius, wisdom and virtue.

It is easy to see, fellow citizens, that the failure has resulted, not from the faults of our statesmen, but from the peculiar constitutions and characters of political parties, on which they relied for power. Solid, enduring and constant parties, inspired by love of country, reverence for virtue and devotion to human liberty, bold in their conceptions of measures, moderate in success, and resolute throughout reverses, are essential to effective and beneficent administration in every free state. Unanimity, even in a wise, just and necessary policy, can never be expected in any country all at once, and without thorough debate and earnest conflicts of opinion. All public movements are therefore undertaken and prosecuted through the agencies, not of individuals, but of parties, regulated, excited and moderated, as occasion may require, by their representatives. He who proposes means so impracticable that he can win no party to their support, may be a philanthropist, but he cannot be a statesman; and even when the leader in administration is thus sustained, he is, although never so earnest or wise, everywhere and at all times inefficient and imbecile, just in the degree that the party on which he depends is inconstant, vacillating, timid or capricious. What has become of the several political parties which have flourished within your time and mine? That dashing, unterrified, defiant party, whose irresistible legions carried the honest and intrepid hero of New Orleans on their shields, through so many civil encounters—that generous, though not unprejudiced whig party, which, apprehensive of perpetual danger from too radical policies of administration, so often with unabated chivalry and enthusiasm, magically recombined its bruised and scattered columns, even when a capricious fortune had turned its rare and hard won triumphs into defeats more disastrous

than the field fights which it had lost—the recent American party, that sprang at one bound from ten thousand dark chambers, and which seemed only yesterday at the very point of carrying the government by a *coup de main*. All these parties, that for brief periods seemed so strong and so unchanging, have perished, leaving no deep impression on the history of the country they aimed to direct and rule forever. The democratic party, too, that has clothed itself so complacently with the pleasant traditions of all preceding parties, and combined so felicitously the most popular of our rational sympathies with the most inveterate and repulsive of our conservative interests, that has won the south so dexterously, by stimulating its maddest ambition, and yet has held the north so tenaciously and so long, by awakening its wildest and most demoralizing fears. What is its condition? It is distinguished in fortune from its extinguished rivals only by the circumstance that both portions of its crew, divided as the hulk breaks into two not unequal parts, retain sufficient energy in their despair to seize on the drifting wrecks of other parties, and by a cunning though hopeless carpentry, to frame wretched and rickety rafts on which to sustain themselves for one dark night more on the tempestuous sea of national politics. All these parties, it is now manifest, were organized, not specially to establish justice and maintain freedom and equality among an honest, jealous and liberty-loving people, but to achieve some material public advantage of temporary importance, or to secure the advancement of some chief to whose discretion, as if the government were an elective despotism instead of a republic, the distribution of its patronage and the direction of its affairs should be implicitly confided. They did, indeed, out of respect or fear of generous reforms, often affect to express elevated principles and generous sentiments in their carefully elaborated creeds, but these creeds, nevertheless, even when not ambiguously expressed, were from time to time revised and qualified and modified, so that at last the interpreters, who alone had them by heart, and were able to repeat them, were found perverting the constitution in its most unequivocal parts, and most palpable meaning, disparaging and rejecting the Declaration of Independence, and stultifying the founders of the republic. The parties thus constituted, dependent not on any national or even on any natural sentiment, but on mere discipline for their cohesion, and coming at last through constant demoraliza-

tion, to assume that capital and not labor, property and not liberty, is the great interest of every people, and that religion, conversant only with the relations of men to an unseen and future world, must be abjured in their conduct toward each other on earth, have finally discarded justice and humanity from their systems, broken up nearly all the existing combinations for spiritual ends, and attempted to conduct affairs of government on principles equally in violation of the constitution and of the eternal laws of God's providence for the regulation of the universe.

These views of the characters of our modern parties, are by no means newly conceived on my part. In that high and intensely exciting debate in congress in the year 1850, which, overruling the administration of General Taylor, brought the two then dominating parties into a compromise at the time solemnly pronounced final, irrevocable and eternal, but which was nevertheless scattered to the winds of Heaven only four years afterward, the great statesman of Kentucky denounced party spirit as he assumed it to be raging throughout the country, as pregnant with the imminent and intolerable disasters of civil war and national dissolution. I ventured then to reply that, in my humble judgment, it was not a conflict of parties that we then were seeing and hearing, but it was, on the contrary, the agony of distracted parties, a convulsion resulting from the too narrow foundations of both of the great parties and of all the parties of the day, foundations that had been laid in compromises of natural justice and human rights—that a new and great question—a moral question transcending the too narrow creeds of existing parties had arisen—that the public conscience was expanding with it, and the green withes of party combinations were giving way and breaking under the pressure—that it was not the Union that was decaying and dying, as was supposed, of the fever of party spirit, but that the two great parties were smitten with paralysis, fatal indeed to them unless they should consent to be immediately renewed and reörganized, borrowing needful elements of health and vigor from a cordial embrace with the humane spirit of the age.

But to exempt our statesmen by casting blame on our political parties, does not reach, but only approximates the real source of responsibility. All of these parties have been composed of citizens, not a few but many citizens, in the aggregate all the citizens of the republic. They were not ignorant, willful or dishonest citizens, but

sincere, faithful and useful members of the state. The parties of our country, what are they at any time, but ourselves, the people of our country? Thus the faults of past administration, and of course the responsibility for existing evils, are brought directly home to yourselves and myself—to the whole people. This is no hard saying. The wisest, justest and most virtuous of men occasionally errs and has need daily to implore the Divine goodness, that he be not led further into temptation; and just so the wisest, justest and most virtuous of nations often unconsciously lose and depart from their ancient, approved and safer ways. Is there any society, even of Christians, that has never had occasion to reform its practice, retrace its too careless steps and discard heresies that have corrupted its accepted faith? What was the English revolution of 1688, but a return from the dark and dangerous road of absolutism? What the French revolution, but a mighty convulsion, that while it carried a brave, enlightened and liberty-loving nation backward on their progress of three hundred years, owed all its horrors to the delay which had so long postponed the needed reaction!

A national departure always happens when a great emergency occurs unobserved and unfelt, bringing the necessity for the attainment of some new and important object, which can only be secured through the inspiration of some new but great and generous national sentiment.

Let us see if we can ascertain, in the present case, when our departure from the right and safe way occurred. Certainly it was not in the revolutionary age. The nation then experienced and felt a stern necessity, perceived and resolutely aimed at a transcendently sublime object, and accepted cheerfully the awakening influences of an intensely moving and generous principle. The necessity was deliverance from British oppression; the object, independence; the principle, the inalienable rights of man. The revolution was a success, because the country had in Adams and Jefferson and Washington and their associates the leaders, and in the whigs the party, needful for this crisis, and these were sustained by the people.

Our departure was not at the juncture of the establishment of the constitution. The country then had and owned a new and overpowering necessity, perceived and demanded a new object, and adopted a new and most animating principle. The necessity, the escape from anarchy; the object, federal Union; the principle, fra-

ternity of the American people. The constitution, with the ordinance of 1787, practically a part of it, was not a failure, because Hamilton and Jay and Madison and King were competent, and the federal party was constant, and the people gave it a confiding and generous support.

It was not in 1800, that the national deviation took place. Then were disclosed a new public necessity, new object, and new principle. A separation and removal of aristocratic checks and interests from the mechanism of our republican institutions. The needed reform did not fail, because Jefferson and George Clinton, with their associates, braved all resistance, the republican party defended, and the people sustained them.

Again, the departure did not occur in 1812. Then was discovered a further necessity, bringing into view a further object and introducing yet another new and noble principle of action. The necessity, a vindication of national rights; the object, freedom of intercourse with mankind; the principle, the defense of our homes and our honor. The war of 1812 was a success, because Clay, Calhoun and Tompkins did not shrink from the trial; the republican party approved and the people sustained them.

In 1820, however, the nation had unconsciously reached and entered a new stage in its successful career, namely, that of expansion. By purchases from France and Spain it had extended its borders from the St. Mary's southward around the peninsula of Florida, and from the Mississippi to the Rocky mountains, an expansion to be afterwards indefinitely continued. We all know the advantages of expansion. They are augmented wealth and population. But we all know equally well, if we will only reflect, that no new advantage is ever gained in national more than in individual life without exposure to some new danger. What then is the danger which attends expansion? It is nothing less and can be nothing less than an increase of the strain upon the bonds of the Union. The time had come to organize government finally in the newly acquired territory of Louisiana, on principles that should be applied thereafter in all cases of further expansion. This necessity brought into glaring light a new object, namely, since the only existing cause of mutual alienation among the states was slavery, which was already carefully circumscribed by the ordinance of 1787, that anomalous institution must now be further circumscribed by extending the ordi-

nance to cover the new states to be established in the Louisiania purchase. To this end a new and humane impulse naturally moved the country, namely, the freedom of human labor.

But although statesmen qualified for the crisis appeared, no party stood forth to support them with constancy, and the country, after a temporary glow of free soil excitement, subsided into cold indifference—and so a compromise was made which divided the newly acquired domain between free labor and capital in slaves, between freedom and slavery, a memorable compromise, which, after a trial of only thirty-four years, proved to be effective only in its concessions to slavery, while its greater guaranties of freedom were found unavailing and worthless. History says that the compromise of 1820 was necessary to save the Union from disruption. I do not dispute history, nor debate the settled moral questions of the past. I only lament that it was necessary, if indeed it was so. History tells us that the course then adopted was wise. I do not controvert it. I only mourn the occurrence of even one case most certainly the only one that ever did happen, in which the way of wisdom has failed to be also the way of pleasantness, and the path of peace. It was in 1820, therefore, that the national deviation began. We have continued ever since the divergent course then so inconsiderately entered, until at last we have reached a point, where, amid confusion, bewilderment and mutual recriminations, it seems alike impossible to go forward or to return. We have added territory after territory, and region after region with the customary boldness of feebly resisted conquerors, not merely neglecting to keep slavery out of our new possessions, but actually removing all the barriers against it which we found standing at the times of conquest. In doing this we have defied the moral opinions of mankind, overturned the laws and systems of our fathers, and dishonored their memories by declaring that the unequaled and glorious constitution which they gave us, carries with it, as it attends our eagles, not freedom and personal rights to the oppressed, but slavery and a hateful and baleful commerce in slaves, wherever we win a conquest by sea or land over the whole habitable globe.

While we must now, in deference to history, excuse the first divergence, it is manifest that our subsequent persistence in the same course has been entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Canada, what remains of Mexico, all of the

West Indies and Central America, are doubtless very desirable, but we have patiently waited for them, and are now likely to wait until they can be acquired without receiving slavery with them, or extending it over them. Nay, all the resistance we have ever met in adding Spanish American territories to our republic, has resulted from our willful and perverse purpose of subverting freedom there, to blight the fairest portion of the earth, when we found it free, by extending over it our only national agency of desolation. We may doubtless persist still further. We may add conquest to conquest, for resistance to our ambition daily grows more and more impossible, until we surpass in extent and apparent strength the greatest empires of ancient or modern times, all the while enlarging the area of African bondage; but after our already ample experience, I think no one will be bold enough to deny that we equally increase the evils of discontent and the dangers of domestic faction.

While I lament the national divergence I have thus described, I do not confess it to be altogether inexcusable. Much less do I blame any one or more of our politicians or parties, while exempting others. All are, in different degrees perhaps, responsible alike, and all have abundant, if not altogether adequate excuses. Deviations once begun, without realizing the immediate presence of danger, it was easier to continue on than to return. The country has all the time been growing richer and more prosperous and populous. It was not unnatural that we should disregard warnings of what we were assured by high though interested authorities, always were distant, improbable and even visionary dangers. It cannot be denied that the African races among us are abject, although their condition, and even their presence here, are due not to their will or fault, but to our own, and that they have a direct interest in the question of slavery. How natural has it been to assume that the motive of those who have protested against the extension of slavey, was an unnatural sympathy with the negro instead of what it always has really been, concern for the welfare of the white man. There are few, indeed, who ever realize that the whole human race suffers somewhat in the afflictions and calamities which befall the humblest and most despised of its members.

The argument, though demanding the most dispassionate calmness and kindness, has too often been conducted with anger and broken out into violence.

Moreover, alarms of disunion were sounded, and strange political inventions like the floating fire ships sent down the St. Lawrence, by the besieged in Quebec, to terrify the army of Wolfe on the island of St. Louis, appeared suddenly before us whenever we proposed to consider in good earnest the subject of federal slavery.

We love, and we ought to love the fellowship of our slaveholding brethren. How natural, therefore, has it been to make the concessions so necessary to silence their complaints, rather than by seeming impracticability in what was thought a matter of indifference, to lose such congenial a companionship. Again, at least, present peace and safety, together with some partial guaranties and concessions of freedom, were from time to time obtained by compromises. Who had the right, or who the presumption to say, with the certainty of being held responsible for casting imputations of bad faith upon our southern brethren, that these compromises would, when their interests should demand it, be disavowed and broken?

Other nations, we have assumed, are jealous of our growing greatness. They have censured us, perhaps with unjust asperity, for our apostacy in favor of slavery. How natural and even patriotic has it been on our part to manifest by persistence our contempt and defiance of such interested and hostile animadversions. Besides, though slavery is indeed now practically a local and peculiar institution of the south, it was not long ago the habit and practice of the whole American people. It is only twenty-five years since our British brethren abolished slavery in their colonies, and only half a century since we or any European nation interdicted the African slave trade. Scarcely three generations have passed away since the subject of the wrongfulness of slavery first engaged the consideration of mankind.

You and I indeed understand now very well how it is that slavery in the territories of the United States is left open by the constitution to our utmost peaceful opposition, while within the slave states it is entrenched behind local constitutions beyond the reach of external legislation. But the subject is a complex one, and the great masses of the people to whom it has only been recently presented, and doubtlessly often presented, under unfavorable circumstances, might well desire time for its careful and deliberate examination.

It seems a bold suggestion to say, that a great nation ought to reconsider a practice of forty years' duration; but forty years of a

nation's life are equivalent to only one year of the life of an individual. The thought is at least consistent with political philosophy, for it is not more true that personal persistence in error leads inevitably to ruin, than it is that every nation exists by obedience to the same moral laws which direct individual life, that they are written in its original constitution, and it must continually reform itself according to the spirit of those laws or perish.

My humble advice, then, fellow citizens, is, that we return and reëstablish the original policy of the nation, and henceforth hold, as we did in the beginning, that slavery is and must be only a purely local, temporary and exceptional institution, confined within the slave states where it already exists, while freedom is the general, normal, enduring and permanent condition of society within the jurisdiction, and under the authority of the constitution of the United States.

I counsel thus for a simple reason incapable of illumination. Slavery, however it may be at any time or in any place excused, is at all times and everywhere unjust and inhuman in its very nature; while freedom, however it may be at any time or in any place neglected, denied or abused, is in its nature right, just and beneficent. It can never, under any circumstances, be wise to persevere, voluntarily, in extending or fortifying an institution that is intrinsically wrong or cruel. It can never be unwise, wherever it is possible, to defend and fortify an existing institution that is founded on the rights of human nature. Insomuch as opinions are so materially, and yet so unconsciously, affected and modified by time, place and circumstances, we may hold these great truths firmly, without impeaching the convictions or the motives of those who deny them in argument or in practice.

I counsel thus for another reason quite as simple as the first. Knowledge, emulation and independence among the members of a social state are the chief elements of national wealth, strength and power. Ignorance, indolence and bondage of individuals are always sources of national imbecility and decline. All nations in their turns have practised slavery. Most of them have abolished it. The world over, the wealthiest and most powerful nations have been those which tolerated it least, and which earliest and most completely abolished it. Virginia and Texas are thrown into a panic even now by the appearance or even the suspicion of a handful of men within their

borders instigating civil war. Massachusetts and Vermont defied British invasion backed by treason, eighty years ago.

Thirdly. There is no necessity now to fortify or extend slavery within the United States or on the American continent. All the supposed necessities of that sort ever before known, have passed away forever. Let us briefly review them. With the discovery and conquest of America confessedly came a responsibility to reclaim it from nature and to introduce civilization. Unfortunately Spain and Portugal, the discoverers and conquerors, were, of all the European states in the sixteenth century, the worst qualified and least able to colonize. They were neither populous, nor industrious, nor free; but were nations of princes and subjects; of soldiers, navigators, nobles, priests, poets and scholars, without merchants, mechanics, farmers or laborers. The art of navigation was imperfect; its practice dangerous, and the new world that the pope had divided between his two most loyal crown-wearing children was in its natural state pestilential. European emigration was therefore impracticable. In the emergency the conquerors, with ruffian violence, swept off at once the gold and silver ornaments which they found in the temples and on the persons of the natives, ignorant of their European values, and subjugated and enslaved the natives themselves. But these simple children of the forest, like the wild flowers when the hurricane sweeps over the prairies, perished under cruelties so contrary to nature.

The African trade, in prisoners of war spared from slaughter, afforded an alternative. The chiefs sold ten men, women or children for a single horse. The conquerors of America brought this unnatural merchandise to our coasts. When the English colonists of North America, happily in only a very limited degree, borrowed from their predecessors this bad practice of slavery, they borrowed also the wretched apology, a want of an adequate supply of free labor. It was then thought an exercise of Christian benevolence to rescue the African heathen from eternal suffering in a future state, and through the painful path of earthly bondage to open to him the gates of the celestial paradise. But all this is now changed. We are at last no feeble or sickly colonies, but a great, populous, homogeneous nation, unsurpassed and unequaled in all the elements of colonization and civilization. Free labor here continually increases and abounds, and is fast verging towards European standards of

value. There is not one acre too much in our broad domain for the supply of even three generations of our free population, with their certain increase. Immigration from Europe is crowding our own sons into the western region, and this movement is daily augmented by the application of new machines for diminishing mechanical and even agricultural labor. At this very moment, congress, after a long and obstinate reluctance, finds itself obliged to yield a homestead law to relieve the pressure of labor in the Atlantic states. Certainly, therefore, we have no need and no room for African slaves in the federal territories. Do you say that we want more sugar and more cotton, and therefore must have more slaves and more slave labor? I answer, first, that no class or race of men have a right to demand sugar, cotton, or any other comfort of human life to be wrung for them, through the action of the federal government, from the unrewarded and compulsory labor of any other class or race of men.

I answer, secondly, that we have sugar and cotton enough already for domestic consumption, and a surplus of the latter for exportation without any increase of slave territory. Do you say that Europe wants more sugar and cotton than we can now supply? I reply, let then Europe send her free laborers hither, or into Italy, or into the West Indies, or into the East; or, if it suit them better, let them engage the natives of cotton-growing regions in the old world, to produce cotton and sugar voluntarily, and for adequate compensation. Such a course, instead of fortifying and enlarging the sway of slavery here, will leave us free to favor its gradual removal. It will renew or introduce civilization on the shores of the Mediterranean and throughout the coasts of the Indian ocean. Christianity, more fully developed and better understood now than heretofore, turns with disgust and horror from the employment of force and piracy as a necessary agent of the gospel.

Fourthly. All the subtle evasions and plausible political theories which have heretofore been brought into the argument for an extension of slavery, have at last been found fallacious and frivolous.

It is unavailing now to say that this government was made by and for white men only, since even slaves owed allegiance to Great Britain before the revolution, equally with white men, and were equally absolved from it by the revolution, and are not only held to allegiance now under our laws, but are also subjected to taxation and actual representation in every department of the federal government.

No government can excuse itself from the duty of protecting the extreme rights of every human being, whether foreign or native born, bond or free, whom it compulsorily holds within its jurisdiction. The great fact is now fully realized that the African race here is a foreign and feeble element like the Indians, incapable of assimilation, but not the less, therefore, entitled to such care and protection as the weak everywhere may require from the strong; that it is a pitiful exotic unwisely and unnecessarily transplanted into our fields, and which it is unprofitable to cultivate at the cost of the desolation of the native vineyard. Nor will the argument that the party of slavery is national and that of freedom sectional, any longer avail when it is fully understood that, so far as it is founded in truth, it is only a result of that perversiou of the constitution which has attempted to circumscribe freedom, and to make slavery universal throughout the republic. Equally do the reproaches, invectives and satires of the advocates of slavery extension fail, since it is seen and felt that truth, reason and humanity can work right on without fanaticism, and bear contumely without retaliation. I counsel this course further, because the combinations of slavery are broken up, and can never be renewed with success. Any new combination must be based on the principle of the southern democratic faction, that slavery is inherently just and beneficent, and ought to be protected, which can no longer be tolerated in the north; or else on the principle of the northern democratic faction that slavery is indifferent and unworthy of federal protection, which is insufficient in the south: while the national mind has actually passed far beyond both of these principles, and is settled in the conviction that slavery, wherever and howsoever it exists, exists only to be regretted and deplored.

I counsel this course further, because the necessity for a return to the old national way has become at last absolute and imperative. We can extend slavery into new territories, and create new slave states only by reöpening the African slave trade; a proceeding which, by destroying all the existing values of the slaves now held in the country, and their increase, would bring the north and the south into complete unanimity in favor of that return.

Finally, I counsel that return because a statesman has been designated who possesses, in an eminent and most satisfactory degree, the virtues and the qualifications necessary for the leader in so great and generous a movement; and I feel well assured that Abraham Lin-

coln will not fail to reïnaugurate the ancient constitutional policy in the administration of the government successfully, because the republican party, after ample experience, has at last acquired the courage and the constancy necessary to sustain him, and because I am satisfied that the people, at last fully convinced of the wisdom and necessity of the proposed reformation, are prepared to sustain and give it effect.

But when it shall have been accomplished, what may we expect then; what dangers must we incur; what disasters and calamities must we suffer? I answer, no dangers, disasters or calamities. All parties will acquiesce, because it will be the act of the people, in the exercise of their sovereign power, in conformity with the constitution and laws, and in harmony with the eternal principles of justice, and the benignant spirit of the age in which we live. All parties and all sections will alike rejoice in the settlement of a controversy which has agitated the country and disturbed its peace so long. We shall regain the respect and good will of the nations, and once more, consistent with our principles and with our ancient character, we shall, with their free consent, take our place at their head, in their advancing progress, toward a higher and more happy, because more humane and more genial civilization.

DEMOCRACY THE CHIEF ELEMENT OF GOVERNMENT.

MADISON, WISCONSIN, SEPTEMBER 12, 1860.

It is a political law—and when I say political law, I mean a higher law, a law of Providence—that empire has, for the last three thousand years, so long as we have records of civilization, made its way constantly westward, and that it must continue to move on westward until the tides of the renewed and of the decaying civilizations of the world meet on the shores of the Pacific ocean. Within a year I have seemed to myself to follow the track of empire in its westward march for three thousand years. I stood but a year ago on the hill of Calvary. I stood soon afterward on the Piræus of Athens. Again I found myself on the banks of the Tiber. Still advancing westward I rested under the shades of the palaces of the kings of England, and trod the streets of the now renovated capital of France. From those capitals I made my way at last to Washington, the city of established empire for the present generation of men, and of influence over the destinies of mankind.

Empire moves far more rapidly in modern than it did in ancient times. The empire established at Washington, is of less than a hundred years' formation. It was the empire of thirteen Atlantic American states. Still, practically, the mission of that empire is fulfilled. The power that directs it is ready to pass away from those thirteen states, and although held and exercised under the same constitution and national form of government, yet it is now in the very act of being transferred from the thirteen states east of the Alleghany mountains and on the coast of the Atlantic ocean, to the twenty states that lie west of the Alleghanies, and stretch away from their base to the base of the Rocky mountains. The political power of the republic, the empire, is already here in the plain that stretches between the great lakes on the east and the base of the Rocky mountains on the west; and you are heirs to it. When the next census shall reveal your power, you will be found to be the

masters of the United States of America, and through them the dominating political power of the world. Our mission, if I may say that I belong to that eastern and falling empire instead of the rising western one—the mission of the thirteen states has been practically accomplished. And what is it? Just like the mission of every other power on earth. To reproduce, to produce a new and greater and better power than we have been ourselves, to introduce on the stage of human affairs twenty new states and to prepare the way for twenty more, before whose rising greatness and splendor, all our own achievements pale and fade away. We have done this with as much forethought perhaps as any people ever exercised, by saving the broad domain which you and these other forty states are to occupy, saving it for your possession, and so far as we had virtue enough, by surrounding it with barriers against the intrusion of ignorance, superstition and slavery.

Because you are to rise to the ascendant and exercise a dominating influence, you are not, therefore, to cast off the ancient and honored thirteen that opened the way for you and marshaled you into this noble possession, nor are you to cast off the new states of the west. But you are to lay still broader foundations, and to erect still more noble columns to sustain the empire which our fathers established, and which it is the manifest will of our Heavenly Father shall reach from the shores of the lakes to the gulf of Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. It was a free government which they established, and it was a self-government—a government such as, on so large a scale, or indeed on any scale, has never before existed. I know that when you consider what a magnificent destiny you have before you, to lay your hand on the Atlantic coast, and to extend your power to the Pacific ocean and grasp the great commerce of the east, you will fully appreciate the responsibility. It is only to be done by maintaining the democratic system of government. There is no other name given under heaven by which, in this generation, nations can be saved from desolation and ruin, than democracy. This, to many conservative ears, would seem a strange proposition; and yet it is so simple that I lack the power almost of elucidating it. Look at England. She is ambitious, as she well may be, and ought to be, to retain that dominion, reaching into every part of the habitable globe, which she now exercises. She is likely to do it, too, and may do it, by reducing, every successive

year, the power of her aristocracy, and introducing more and more, the popular element of democracy into the administration of her government.

In many respects the government of England, though more aristocratic, is still less monarchical than our own. The British empire exists to-day only by recognizing and gradually adopting the great truth that if the British empire is to stand, it is the British people who are to maintain that empire and enjoy and exercise it. France, the other great European power, which seems to stand firmer now than ever, and to be renewing her career of prosperity and glory—France, under the form of a despotism, has adopted the principle of universal suffrage, and the empire of France to-day is a democracy. The Austrian empire is falling. And why? Because democracy is rising in Germany to demand the liberation of the people of its various nations, and the exercise of universal suffrage. And Italy to-day all along the coast of the Mediterranean, is rising up to the dignity of renewed national life, by adopting the principle of universal suffrage and the limitation of power by the action of the whole people.

Now if in the Old World, where government and empire are entrenched and established so strong in hereditary aristocracy, no empire can stand except as it yields to the democratic principle; look around over the United States of America, and say how long you can hold these states in a federal union or maintain one common authority or empire here, except on the principles of democracy? Therefore, it is that, I say, that you of the northwest are, above all things, first, last, and all the time, to recognize as the great element of the republic, the system and principles of democracy.

But, fellow citizens, it is easy to talk about democracy. I have heard some men prate of it by the hour, and admire it, and shout for it, and express their reverence for it; and yet I have seen that they never comprehend the simplest element of democracy? What is it? Is it the opposite of monarchy or of aristocracy? Aristocracy is maintained everywhere, in all lands, by one of two systems, or by both combined. An aristocracy is the government in which the privileged own the lands, and the many unprivileged work them, or in which the few privileged own the laborers and the laborers work for them. In either case the laborer works on compulsion, and under the constraint of force; and in either case he takes that which

may remain after the wants of the owners of land or labor are both satisfied. The laborer must rest content with the privilege of being protected in his personal rights; and the powers of the government are exercised by the owner, of labor and of land.

Here, then, you see I have brought you to the consideration of the great problem of society in this republic or empire. It is this: Is there any danger that in the United States the citizen will not be the owner of the land which he cultivates? If there is any part of the United States where the labor or the land is monopolized by capital, there is a place in which the democratic element has not yet had its introduction or been permitted to work its way effectually. So, on the other hand, as here, where you are, no man can monopolize the land which another man is obliged to cultivate, much less monopolize the labor by which the lands on your fields are cultivated, you are entirely and absolutely established and grounded on democratic principles. But, you all know, that has not always been the history of our whole country, and, at times, was not the condition of any part of it. Some two hundred years ago, when laborers were scarce, and the field to be cultivated was large, private citizens of the Atlantic states, driven, as they said, by the cupidity of the British government, introduced the labor of slaves into the American colonies, and then established the aristocracy of land and labor. The system pervaded nearly the whole Atlantic states. If it had not been interrupted it would have pervaded the continent of America; and instead of what you see, and of what you are a part, and of what you do,—instead of emigration from the eastern states into the prairies of the west, and instead of emigration from Europe all over the United States, you would have had in the northwest this day the Boston and New York merchant importing laborers instead of freemen into the seaports, and dispersing them over the entire valley of the Mississippi. That would have been the condition of civilization on this continent. It has been fortunate for you, and fortunate for us, that such a desecration of the magnificent scene, provided by nature for the improvement of human society and for the increase of human happiness, has been arrested so soon; and you will see how felicitous it is when for one moment you compare the condition of Wisconsin, and of Maine, and of Iowa, and of Illinois, and of Indiana, and of all the free states of the Union, with the islands of the West Indies, colonized just at the same time that

the Atlantic states were colonized, and with the condition of South America, a whole and entire new continent, abounding in the most luxuriant vegetation and with the greatest resources of mineral wealth, absolutely reduced to a condition of perpetual civil war, and ever-renewed ruinous desolation. The salvation of North America from all those disasters that have befallen the southern portion of the continent is the result of bold and firm procedure on the part of your ancestors and mine, less than a hundred years ago.

The government of the United States was established in an auspicious moment. The world had become aroused to the injustice as well as to the inexpediency of the system of slavery, and the people of the United States, rising up to the dignity of the decision that was before them, determined to prevent the further extension, and, as far and fast as possible, to secure the abolition of African slavery. It was under the influence of a high, righteous, noble, humane excitement like that, that even the state of Virginia, itself a slave state, like the state of New York, determined that, so far as her power and her will could command the future, slavery should cease forever; first, by abolishing the African slave trade, which would bring about, ultimately, the cessation of domestic slavery; and, in the second place, by declaring that her consent to the cession of territory northwest of the Ohio, of which you occupy so beautiful a part, was given with the express condition that it should never be the home of slavery or involuntary servitude.

But, I need not remind you that this, like most other efforts of human society to do good and to advance the welfare of mankind, had its painful and unfortunate reaction. Hardly twenty years had elapsed after the passage of these noble acts for the foundation of liberty on the North American continent, before there came over the nation a tide of demoralization, the results of which, coming on us with such fearful rapidity, surpass almost our power to describe or to sufficiently deplore.

What have we seen since that was done? We have seen the people of the United States—for it is of no use to cast responsibility on parties, or administrations, or statesmen—extend slavery all around the coast of the gulf of Mexico. We have seen them take Texas into the Union, and agree that she should come in as a slave state, and have the right to multiply herself into four more slave states. We have seen California and New Mexico conquered by the people

of the United States, with the deliberate consent, if not purpose, that slavery should be extended from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. We have seen the constitution of the United States perverted by the consent of the people until that constitution, instead of being a law of freedom and a citadel of human rights, has come to be pronounced by the affected judgment and willing consent of the highest tribunal of the United States, yet enjoying the confidence and support of the people, to be a tower and bulwark of human slavery, of African bondage; and you have it now announced by the government of the United States, which you yourselves brought into power, that wherever the constitution of the United States goes, it carries, not freedom with the eagles of conquest, but hateful bondage. If the principle which you have thus permitted to be established is true, then there is not an arsenal within the United States, not a military or naval school of the federal government, not a federal jail, not a dock yard, not a ship that traverses the ocean bearing the American flag in any part of the world, where the law, the normal law, the law by which men are tried and judged, is not a law by which every man whose ancestor was a slave is a slave, and by which property in slaves, not freedom of man, is the real condition of society under the federal system of government. I can only ask you to consider for a moment how near you have come to losing everything which you enjoy of this great interest of freedom. The battle culminated at last on the fields of Kansas.

How severe and how dreadful a battle that has been, you all know. It was a great and desperate effort of the aristocracy of capital in labor, to carry their system practically with all its evils to the shores of the gulf of Mexico, and to cut off the Atlantic states from all communication with the sister states on the Pacific, and so extend slavery from the centre, both ways, restoring it throughout the whole country. You will say that this was a very visionary attempt; but it was far from being visionary. It was possible, and for a time seemed fearfully probable—probable for this reason, that the land must have labor, and that it must be either the labor of freemen or the labor of slaves. Introduce slave labor in any way that you can, and free labor is repelled, and avoids it. Slave labor was introduced into this country by the opening of the African slave trade, and when the territory of the United States, in the interior of the continent, was open to slavery with your consent and mine, nothing then

would have remained but to reöpen and restore the African slave trade; for it is prohibited only by a law, and the same power that made the law could repeal and abrogate it. The same power that abrogated the Missouri compromise in 1854, would, if the efforts to establish slavery in Kansas had been successful, have been, after a short time, bold enough, daring enough, desperate enough, to have repealed the prohibition of the African slave trade. And, indeed, that is yet a possibility now; for, disguise these issues now before the American people, as they may be disguised by the democratic party, yet it is nevertheless perfectly true, that if you forego your opposition and resistance to slavery, if this popular resistance should be withdrawn, or should, for any reason, cease, then the African slave trade, which at first illegally renews itself along the coasts of our southern states, would gradually steal up the Mississippi, until the people, tired with a hopeless resistance, should become indifferent, and African slavery would once more become the disgraceful trade of the American flag.

Now, all these evils would have happened, all this abandonment of the continent of North America to slavery would have happened, and have been inevitable, had resistance to it depended alone on the people of the thirteen original states. We were already overpowered there. From one end of the Atlantic states to the other, there were, in 1850, scarcely three states which did not declare that henceforth they gave up the contest, and that they were willing that the people of the new territories might have slavery or freedom, and might come into the Union as slave states, or as free states, just as they pleased.

When that had happened, what would have followed? Why, that the people who had the right to slavery if they pleased, had the right to get slaves if they pleased. How, then, were we saved? It seems almost as if it was providential that these new states of the northwest, the state of Michigan, the state of Wisconsin, the state of Iowa, the state of Ohio, founded on this reservation for freedom that had been made in the year 1787, matured just in the critical moment to interpose, to rally the free states of the Atlantic coast, to call them back to their ancient principles, to nerve them to sustain them in the contest at the capitol, and to send their noble and true sons and daughters to the plains of Kansas, to defend, at the peril of their homes, and even their lives, if need were, the precious soil

which had been abandoned by the government to slavery, from the intrusion of that, the greatest evil that has ever befallen our land. You matured in the right time. And how came you to mature? How came you to be better, wiser, than we of the Atlantic states? The reason is a simple one, perfectly plain. Your soil had been never polluted by the footprints of a slave. Every foot of ours had been redeemed from slavery. You are a people educated in the love of freedom, and to whom the practice of freedom and of democracy belongs, for every one of you own the land you cultivate, and no human being that has ever trodden it has worn the manacles of a slave. And you come from other regions too. You come from the south, where you knew the evils of slavery. You come from Germany and from Ireland, and from Holland, and from France, and from all over the face of the globe, where you have learned by experience the sufferings that result from aristocracy and oppression. And you brought away with you from your homes the sentiments, the education of freemen. You came then just at the right moment. You came prepared. You came qualified. You came sent by the Almighty to rescue this land and the whole continent from slavery. Did ever men have a more glorious duty to perform, or a more beneficent destiny before them than the people of the northwestern angle that lies between the Ohio river and the great lakes and the Mississippi? I am glad to see that you are worthy of it, that you appreciate it.

It does not need that I should stimulate you by an appeal to your patriotism, to your love of justice, and to your honor, to perfect this great work, to persevere in it until you shall bring the government of the United States to stand hereafter as it stood forty years ago, a tower of freedom, and a refuge for the oppressed of all lands, instead of a bulwark of slavery. I prefer rather to deal in what may perhaps be not less pleasing to you, and that is, to tell you that the whole responsibility rests henceforth directly or indirectly on the people of the northwest. Abandon that responsibility, and slavery extends from the gulf of Mexico to the gulf of St. Lawrence on the Atlantic coast. There can be no virtue in commercial and manufacturing communities to maintain a democracy, when the democracy themselves do not want a democracy. There is no virtue in Pearl street, in Wall street, in Court street, in Chestnut street, in any other street of great commercial cities, that can save the great demo-

cratic government of ours, when you cease to uphold it with your intelligent votes, your strong and mighty hands. You must, therefore, lead us as we heretofore reserved and prepared the way for you. We resign to you the banner of human rights and human liberty, on this continent, and we bid you be firm, bold and onward, and then you may hope that we will be able to follow you.

I have said that you are to have the responsibility alone. I have shown you that in the Atlantic northern states we were dependent on you. I need not tell you that at present you can expect no effective support or sympathy in the Atlantic southern states.

You must demonstrate the wisdom of our cause by argument, by reason, by the firm exercise of suffrage, in every way in which the human intelligence and human judgment can be convinced of truth and right—you must demonstrate it, giving line upon line, and precept upon precept, overcoming passion and prejudice and enmity, with gentleness, with patience, with loving kindness to your brethren of the slave states, until they shall see that the way of wisdom which you have chosen is also the path of peace. The southwest are sharers with you of the northwest in this great inheritance of empire. It belongs equally to them and to you. They have plains as beautiful. They have rivers as noble. They have all the elements of wealth, prosperity and power that you have. Still from them, from Kentucky and Tennessee, from Missouri and Arkansas, from Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana, you will for the present receive no aid or support; but you will have to maintain your principles in opposition, although I trust not in defiance of them—and that, for the simple reason that in the great year 1787, when Mr. Jefferson proposed that slavery should be excluded in all the public domain of the United States, lying southwest, as well as that lying northwest of the Ohio river, those states had not the forecast, had not the judgment, to surrender the temporary conveniences and advantages of slavery, and to elect, as your ancestors chose for you, the great system of free labor. They chose slavery, and they have to drag out, for some years yet, not long, not so long as some of you will live, but still so long that they will be a drag and a weight upon your movements, instead of lending you assistance—they have got to drag out to the end their system of slave labor. You have, therefore, as you see, the whole responsibility. It depends upon you. You have no reliance upon the Atlantic states of the east, north or south. You

have the opposition of the southern states on either side of the Alleghany mountains; but still the power is with you. You are situated where all powers have ever been, that have controlled the destiny of the nation to which they belonged. You are in the land which produces the wheat and the corn, the cereal grains—the land that is covered with the oak, and where they say the slave cannot live. They are in the land that produces cotton and sugar and the tropical fruits—in the land where *they say* the white man cannot labor; in the land where the white man must perish if he have not a negro slave to provide him with food and raiment. They do, indeed, command the mouths of the rivers; but what is that worth, except as they derive perpetual supplies, perpetual moral reinvigoration, from the hardy sons of the north that reside around the sources of those mighty rivers?

I am sure that in this I am speaking only words of truth and experience. The northwest is by no means so small as you may think it; I speak to you because I feel that I am, and during all my mature life have been, one of you. Although of New York, I am still a citizen of the northwest. The northwest extends eastward to the base of the Alleghany mountains, and does not all of western New York lie westward of the Alleghany mountains? Whence comes all the inspiration of free soil which spreads itself with such cheerful voices over all these plains? Why, from New York westward of the Alleghany mountains.[1] The people before me—who are you but New York men, while you are men of the northwest? It is an old proverb, that men change the skies, but not their minds, when they emigrate; but you have changed neither skies nor mind.

I will add but one word more. This is not the business of this day alone. It is not the business of this year alone. It is not the business of the northwest alone. It is the interest, the destiny of human society on the continent. You are to make this whole continent, from north to south, from east to west, a land of freedom and a land of happiness. There is no power on earth now existing, no empire existing, or as yet established, that is to equal or can equal

[1] At this point of the speech a large number of voices in the audience responded, indicating the different counties in New York, from which they had emigrated, "Cayuga," "Genesee," "Seneca," "Yates," "Ontario," &c., so that Mr. Seward remarked: "Why, I thought I was midway between the Lakes and the Mississippi, but I find I am at home among old neighbors and friends."

in duration the future of the United States. It is not for ourselves alone; you have the least possible interest in it. It is, indeed, for those children of yours. Old John Adams, when, at the close of the revolutionary war, he sat down and counted up the losses and sacrifices that he had endured and made, rejoiced in the establishment of the independence which had been the great object of his life, and said: "I have gained nothing. I should have been even more comfortable, perhaps, and more quiet, had we remained under the British dominion; but for my children, and for their children, and for the children of the generation that labored with me, I feel that we have done a work which entitles us to rejoice, and call upon us by our successes to render our thanks to Almighty God."

THE CONSTITUTION INTERPRETED.[1]

It has been by a simple rule of interpretation that I have studied the constitution of my country. That rule has been simply this: That by no word, no act, no combination into which I might enter, should any one human being of the generation to which I belong, much less any class of human beings, of any nation, race or kindred, be repressed and kept down in the least degree in their efforts to rise to a higher state of liberty and happiness. Amid all the glosses of the times, amid all the essays and discussions to which the constitution of the United States has been subjected, this has been the simple, plain, broad light in which I have read every article and every section of that great instrument. Whenever it requires of me that this hand shall keep down the humblest of the human race, then I will lay down power, place, position, fame, everything, rather than adopt such a construction or such a rule. If, therefore, in this land there are any that would rise, I extend to them, in God's name, a good speed. If there are any in foreign lands who would improve their condition by emigration, or if there be any here who would go abroad in the search of happiness, in the improvement of their condition, or in their elevation to a higher state of dignity and happiness, they have always had, and always shall have, a cheering word and such efforts as I can consistently make in their behalf.

[1] Extract from Mr. Seward's speech, at Madison, September 11, 1860.

POLITICAL EQUALITY THE NATIONAL IDEA.

SAINT PAUL, SEPTEMBER 18, 1860.

ONE needs to have had something of my own experience of living in a state at an early period of its material development and social improvement, and growing up with its growing greatness, to be able to appreciate the feeling with which I am oppressed, on this my first entrance into the capital of the state of Minnesota. Every step of my progress since I reached the Northern Mississippi has been attended by an agreeable and constantly increasing surprise. I had early read the works in which the geographer had described the scenes around me, and I had studied these scenes minutely in the finest productions of art; but still the grandeur, the luxuriance, the geniality of the region were but imperfectly conceived before I saw these sentinel walls that look down on the Mississippi—seen as I beheld them—just when the earliest tinges of the fall give the rich variety of hues to the American forest. I thought how much of taste and genius had been wasted in celebrating the highlands of Scotland and the mountains of Palestine, before civilized man had reached the banks of the Mississippi. And then that beautiful lake Pepin scene, at the close of the day, when the autumnal green of the shores was lost in a deep blue hue that emulated that of the heavens; the moistened atmosphere reflected the golden rays of the setting sun, and the skies above seemed to come down to complete the gorgeous drapery of the scene. It was a piece of upholstery such as no hand but that of nature could have made. This magnificent lake, I said to myself, is a fitting vestibule to the capital of the state of Minnesota—a state which I have loved, which I ever shall love, for more reasons than time would now allow me to mention, but chiefly because it was one of three states which my own voice had been potential in bringing into the Federal Union. Every one of the three was a free state, and I believe on my soul that, of the whole three, Minnesota is the freest of all.

I find myself now, for the first time, on the highlands in the center of the continent of North America, equidistant from the waters of Hudson's bay and the gulf of Mexico, from the Atlantic ocean to the ocean in which the sun sets—here on the spot where spring up, almost side by side, and so near that they may kiss each other, the two great rivers of the continent, the one of which pursuing its strange, capricious, majestic, vivacious course through rapids and cascade, lake after lake, bay after bay, and river after river, till, at last, after a course of two thousand five hundred miles, it brings your commerce into the ocean midway to the ports of Europe, and the other, which meandering through woodland and prairie a like distance of two thousand five hundred miles, taking in tributary after tributary from the east and from the west, bringing together the waters from the western declivity of the Alleghanies and the torrents which roll down the eastern sides of the Rocky mountains, finds the Atlantic ocean in the gulf of Mexico. Here is the central place where the agriculture of the richest regions of North America must begin its magnificent supplies to the whole world. On the east, all along the shore of lake Superior, and on the west, stretching in one broad plain, in a belt across the continent, is a country where state after state is yet to rise, and whence the productions for the support of human society in other crowded states must forever go forth. This is then a commanding field; but it is as commanding in regard to the commercial future, for power is not to reside permanently on the eastern slope of the Alleghany mountains, nor in the seaports of the Pacific. Seaports have always been controlled at last by the people of the interior. The people of the inland and of the upland, those who inhabit the sources of the mighty waters, are they who supply all states with the materials of wealth and power. The seaports will be the mouths by which we shall communicate and correspond with Europe, but the power that shall speak and shall communicate and express the will of men on this continent, is to be located in the Mississippi valley, and at the source of the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence. In other days, studying what might perhaps have seemed to others a visionary subject, I have cast about for the future the ultimate central seat of power of the North American people. I have looked at Quebec and at New Orleans, at Washington and at San Francisco, at Cincinnati and at St. Louis, and it has been the result of my best conjecture that the seat

of power for North America would yet be found in the valley of Mexico; that the glories of the Aztec capital would be renewed, and that city would become ultimately the capital of the United States of America. But I have corrected that view, and I now believe that the last seat of power on the great continent will be found somewhere within a radius not very far from the very spot where I stand, at the head of navigation on the Mississippi river and on the great Mediterranean lakes.

I have often seen, but never with great surprise, that on the occasion of a revival of religion, the oldest, the most devout, the most religious preacher—he whose life had seemed to me and to the world to be better ordered according to the laws of God and of affection to mankind, has discovered that he had been entirely mistaken in his own experience, and that he now found out, to his great grief and astonishment, that he had never before been converted, and that now for the first time he had become a Christian. While standing here, I almost fall into the notion that I am in the category of that preacher, and although I cannot charge myself with having been really a seditious or ever a disloyal citizen, I have yet never exactly and completely understood the duties that I owed to society and the spirit that belongs to an American citizen. I have never until now occupied that place whence I could grasp the whole grand panorama of the continent, for the happiness of whose present people and of whose future millions of millions, it is the duty of an American statesman to labor. I have often heard it said, and indeed I have thought that one could get a very adequate idea of the greatness of this republic of ours, if he could stand as I have stood on the deck of an American ship of war, as she crossed the Mediterranean, passed through the Ionian islands, ascended the Adriatic, bearing at the mast-head the stripes and stars that command respect and inspire fear equally among the semi-barbarians of Asia and the most polite and powerful nations of Europe. I have often thought that I could lift myself up to the conception of the greatness of this republic of ours by taking a stand on the terrace of the capitol of Washington, and contemplating the concentration of the political power of the American people, and then following out in my imagination the dispatches by which that will, after being modified by the executive and legislative departments, went forth in laws, and edicts, and ordinances for the government and direction of a great people. But, after all, no such place as

either of these is equal to that I now occupy. I seem to myself to stand here on this eminence as the traveler who climbs the dome of St. Peter's in Rome. There, through the opening of that dome, he seems to himself to be in almost direct and immediate communication with the Almighty Power that directs and controls the actions and the wills of men, and he looks down with pity on the priests and votaries below who vainly try, by poring over beads and rituals, to study out and influence the mind of the Eternal. Standing here and looking far off into the northwest, I see the Russian as he busily occupies himself in establishing seaports and towns and fortifications, on the verge of this continent, as the outposts of St. Petersburg, and I can say, "Go on, and build up your outposts all along the coast up even to the Arctic ocean—they will yet become the outposts of my own country—monuments of the civilization of the United States in the northwest." So I look off on Prince Rupert's land and Canada, and see there an ingenious, enterprising and ambitious people, occupied with bridging rivers and constructing canals, railroads and telegraphs, to organize and preserve great British provinces north of the great lakes, the St. Lawrence, and around the shores of Hudson bay, and I am able to say, "It is very well, you are building excellent states to be hereafter admitted into the American Union." I can look southwest and see, amid all the convulsions that are breaking the Spanish American republics, and in their rapid decay and dissolution, the preparatory stage for their reörganization in free, equal and self-governing members of the United States of America. In the same high range of vision I can look down on the states and the people of the Atlantic coast of Maine and Massachusetts, of New York and Pennsylvania, of Virginia and the Carolinas, and Georgia, and Louisiana, and Texas, and round by the Pacific coast to California and Oregon. I can hear their disputes, their fretful controversies, their threats that if their own separate interests are not gratified and consulted by the federal government they will separate from this Union. I am able to say, "peace, be still." These subjects of contention and dispute that so irritate and anger and provoke and alienate you, are but temporary and ephemeral. These institutions which you so much desire to conserve, and for which you think you would sacrifice the welfare of the people of the continent, are almost as ephemeral as yourselves. The man is born to-day who will live to see the American Union, the American people,

coming into the harmonious understanding that this is the land for the white man, and that whatever elements there are to disturb its present peace or irritate the passions of its possessors, will in the end, and that end will come before long, pass away, ineffectual in any way to disturb the harmony of, or endanger the stability of this great Union.

It is under the influence of reflections like these that I thank God here to-day, more fervently than ever, that I live in so great a country as this, and that my lot has been cast in it, not before the period when political society was to be organized, nor yet in that distant period when it is to collapse and fall into ruin, but that I live in the very day and hour when political society is to be effectually organized throughout the entire continent. We seem here, and now for the first time, to be conscious of that high necessity which compels every state in the Union to be, not separate and isolated, but one part of the American republic. We see and feel more than ever, when we come up here, that fervent heat of love and attachment to the region in which our lot is cast, that will not suffer the citizens of Maine, the citizens of South Carolina, the citizens of Texas, or the citizens of Wisconsin or Minnesota to be aliens to, or enemies of, each other, but which, on the other hand, compels them all to be members of one great political family. Aye, and we see now how it is that while society is convulsed with rivalries and jealousies between native and foreign born in our Atlantic cities and on our Pacific coast, and tormented with the rivalries and jealousies produced by difference of birth, of language, and of religion, here, in the central point of the republic, the German, and the Irishman, and the Italian, and the Frenchman, the Hollander and the Norwegian, becomes in spite of himself, almost completely in his own day, and entirely in his own children, an American citizen. We see the unity, in other words, that constitutes, and compels us to constitute, not many nations, not many peoples, but one nation and one people only.

Valetudinarians of the north have been in the habit of seeking the sunny skies of the south to restore their wasting frames under consumption; and invalids of the south have been accustomed to seek the skies of Italy for the same relief. Now you see the valetudinarians of the whole continent, from the frozen north and the burning south, resort to the sources of the Mississippi for an atmos-

phere which shall restore them to health. Do you not see and feel here that this atmosphere has another virtue—that when men from Maine, and from Carolina, and from Mississippi, and from New Hampshire, and from England and Ireland, and Scotland, from Germany and from all other portions of the world come up here, the atmosphere becomes the atmosphere not only of health, but of liberty and freedom? Do we not feel when we come up here, that we have not only found the temple and the shrine of freedom, but that we have come into the actual living presence of the goddess of freedom herself? Once in her presence, we see that no less capacious temple could be fit for the worship that is her due. I wish, my fellow citizens, that all my associates in public life could come up here with me, and learn by experience, as I have done, the elevation and serenity of soul which pervades the people of the great northwest. It is the only region of the United States in which I find fraternity and mutual charity fully developed. Since I first set foot on the soil of the valley of the Upper Mississippi, I have met men of all sects and of all religions; men of the republican party and men of the democratic party, and of the American party, and I have not heard one reproachful word, one intolerant or disdainful sentiment; I have seen that you can differ, and yet not disagree. I have seen that you can love your parties and the statesmen of your choice, and yet love still more the country and its rulers; the people, the sovereign people; not the squatter sovereigns scattered widecast and roving in distant and remote territories which you are never to enter, and so devised that they may be sold, and that the supreme court of the United States may abolish sovereignty and the sovereigns both together. You love the sovereignty that you possess yourselves, in which every man is his own sovereign, the popular sovereignty that belongs to me and the popular sovereignty that belongs to you; the equal popular sovereignty that belongs to every other man who is under the government and protection of the United States. Under the influence of such sentiments and feelings as these, I scarcely know how to act or speak, when I come before you at the command of the republican people of Minnesota as a republican. I feel that if we could be but a little more indulgent a little more patient with each other, and a little more charitable, all the grounds on which we differ would disappear and pass away, just as popular sovereignty is passing away; and let us all, though we cannot confess ourselves

to be all republicans, at least agree that we all are above all parties —American citizens. I see here, moreover, how it is, that in spite of sectional and personal ambition, the form and body and spirit of this nation organized itself and consolidated itself out of the equilibrium of irrepressible and yet healthful political counterbalancing forces, and how out of that equilibrium it produced just exactly that one thing which the interests of this continent and of mankind require should be developed here—and that is, a federal republic of separate republican or democratic states. I see here how little you and I, and those who are wiser and better and greater than you or I, have done, and how little they can do to produce the requisite political condition for the people of this continent, the condition of a free people. I see that, while we seem to ourselves to have been trying to do much and to do everything, and while many fancy that they have done a great deal, yet what we have been doing, what we now are doing, what we shall hereafter do, and what we and those who may come after us shall continue to be doing, is just exactly what was necessary to be done, whether we knew it or not, for the interests of humanity throughout the world, and therefore was certain to be done, because necessity is only another expression or name for the higher law. God ordains that what is useful to be done shall be done. When I survey American society as it is developing fully and perfectly here, I see that it is doing what the exigencies of political society throughout the world have at last rendered it necessary to be done. Society tried for six thousand years how to live and improve and perfect itself under monarchical and aristocratic systems of government, while practising a system of depredation and slavery on each other. The result has been all over the world a complete and absolute failure. At last, at the close of the last century, the failure was discovered, and a revelation was made of the necessity of a system to which henceforth men should cease to enslave each other, and should govern themselves.

Nowhere, in Africa, Asia, or in Europe, was there any open field where this great new work of the organization of a political society under a more auspicious system of government, could be attempted. They were all occupied. This great and unoccupied continent furnished the very theatre that was necessary; and to it came all the bold, and the free, and the brave men throughout the world, who feel and know that necessity, and who have the courage, the manhood, and

the humanity to labor to produce this great organization. Providence set apart this continent for the work, and, as I think, set apart and designated this particular locality for the place whence shall go forth continually the ever-renewing spirit which shall bring the people of all other portions of the continent up to a continual advance in the establishment of the system. I may make myself better understood by saying, that until the beginning of the present century, men had lived the involuntary subjects of political government, and that the time had come when mankind could no longer consent to be so governed by force. The time had come when men were to live voluntary citizens and sovereigns themselves of the states which they possessed, and that is the principle of the government established here. It has only one vital principle. All others are resolved into it. That one principle—what is it? It is the equality of every man who is a member of the state to be governed. If there be not absolute political equality then some portion of the people are governed by force, and are not voluntary citizens; and whenever any portion of the people are governed by force, then you are carried so far backward again toward the old system of involuntary citizenship, or a government by kings, lords, and standing armies. This was the great necessity, not of the people of the United States alone—it was not even the original conception of the people of the United States that a republican government was to be established for themselves alone, but the establishment of the republican system of the United States of America was only bringing out and reducing to actual practice the ideas and opinions which men had already formed, all over the civilized world. If you will refer to the action of our forefathers, you will find that while they did labor, as they might well labor, to secure this government in its republican form for themselves and their posterity, yet they were conscious that they were erecting it as a model of refuge for the people of every nation, kindred and tongue under heaven. The old continental congress of 1787 declared that the interest of the United States was forever the interest of human nature, and that it was the political redemption of human nature that was to be worked out on the continent of North America; and, as I have said, it is to be brought to its perfection here in the valley of the Mississippi.

The framers of the republic conceived this necessity—they assumed this high responsibility. They never could have done so, except

for the crisis of the revolution, which kindled an unknown fire of patriotism within the bosom of the people and enabled them for a brief period to elevate themselves up above temporary and ephemeral interests and prejudices, and to rise to the great test of organizing and constituting a free and purely popular government. The people understood the great principle on which it was to be founded—the political equality of the whole people; and that they did so understand it you will see in the fact that in the Declaration of Independence they lay the foundations of the great republic on the great truth that all men are created equal, and have inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But it was not the good fortune of our fathers to be able to find full and ample materials, all of the right kind, for the erection of the temple of liberty, which they constructed. Providence has so ordered it that uniformly perfect materials for any edifice which the human mind is required to devise, and the human hand to construct, cannot be found anywhere. If you propose to build a lime-stone house here, you may excavate the ground on which it is to be placed and take from the quarry the needed rocks and lay them all away in their proper places in the foundation and walls and vaulted roof; but other materials besides the lime-stone enter into the noblest structure you can make. There must be some lime, and some sand, and some iron, and some wood, and one must combine perfect with imperfect materials to make any human structure. Even the founders of a great republic like this, wishing and intending to place it on the principle of the equality of man, had to take such materials as they found. They had to take society as it was, in which some were free and some were slaves, and to form a Union in which some were free states and some were slave states. They had the ideal before them, but they were unable to perfect it all at once. What did they do? They did as the architect does who raises a structure of stone and lime, and sand, and wood, and iron; where there is a weakness of material, and where the strength of the edifice would be impaired by it, he applies braces, and props, and bulwarks, and buttresses to strengthen and fortify so as to make the weak part combine with, and be held together in solid connection with the firm and strong. That is what our fathers intended to do, and what they did do, when they framed the federal government. Seeing this element of slavery, which they could not eliminate, they said, "We will take care that it shall not

weaken the edifice and bring it down. We will take care that although we cannot get rid of slaves now, the number of slaves hereafter shall diminish and the number of white men shall increase, and that ultimately the element of free white men shall be so strong that the element of slavery shall be inadequate to produce any serious danger, calamity, or disaster." How did they do this? They did it in a simple way by authorizing congress to prohibit, and practically by prohibiting, the African slave trade after the expiration of twenty years from the establishment of the constitution; supposing that if no more slaves were imported, the American people, then almost unanimously in favor of emancipation, would be able to eliminate from the country the small amount of slavery which would be left to decay and decline for want of invigoration by the African slave trade. They did another thing. They set apart the territory northwest of the Ohio river, nearly all of the unoccupied domain of the United States, for freemen only, declaring that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude should ever enter on its soil. They did one thing more. They declared that congress should pass uniform laws of naturalization, so that when the importation of African slaves should cease, voluntary immigration of freemen from all other lands should be encouraged and stimulated. Thus, while unable to exclude slavery from the system, they provided for the rapid development and perfection of the principle that all men are born free and equal.

And now, fellow citizens, we see all around us the results of that wise policy. Certain of the states concurred partially in the policy of the fathers. I hardly need tell you what states they were. They were Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Some other states did not. It is scarcely necessary to name them. They were the six southern states of the Union. The six southern states said, although the constitution has arrested the slave trade and invited emigration, and adopted the policy of making all the men of the new states free and equal, yet we will adhere to the system of slavery. You see how it has worked in the cities of Boston, New York and Philadelphia. You see it in the wheat fields of New York, of Ohio, of Indiana, of Illinois, of Wisconsin. You see it in the flocks and herds of Vermont and New Hampshire; you see it in the cattle that multiply upon ten thousand hills; you see it in the million of spindles in the manufac-

tories of the east, and in the forges and furnaces of Pennsylvania; you see it in the crowded shipping of New York, and in her palaces and towers, emulating the magnificence of the old world, and grasping for itself the commerce of the globe. You see even in California and Oregon the same results; you see them in the copper ore dug out on the banks of lake Superior, the iron in Pennsylvania, the gypsum in New York, the salt in Ohio and New York, the lead in Illinois, and the silver and the gold in the free states of the Pacific coast. In all these you see the fruits of this policy. Neither in forest, nor in mines, nor in manufactories, nor in workshop, is there found one African slave that turns a wheel or supplies the oil which keeps the machinery in motion. On the other hand, you see millions of freemen crowding each other in perpetual waves, rolling over from Europe on the Atlantic coast, and flowing on and forming great states on the western base of the Alleghany mountains—still rolling on again perpetually until it constitutes new states, in which is built up here in Minnesota in nine years, a capital equal to the capital built in any slave state in the Union in two hundred years.

You see here the fruits of this great policy of the fathers. You see what comes of a wise policy. But do not let us mistake it for *policy*. It is not mere policy. It is the national practice of simple justice, of equal and exact justice to all men, for the freedom which we boast so highly, which we love so dearly and so justly, which we prefer above every other earthly good, and without which earth is unfit for the habitation of man. What is it? Nothing but you allowing to me my rights, and I allowing to you equal rights—every man having exactly his own—the right to decide whether he will labor and eat, or will be idle and die; and if he will labor, for what he will labor, and for whom he will labor, and the right to discharge his employer just exactly as the employer can discharge him. You see the fruits of this policy in another way. Go over the American continent from one end of it to the other, wherever the principle of equality has been adopted and adhered to, and every citizen of a state, and every citizen of every other state, and every exile from a foreign nation, may write, print, speak and vote when he acquires the right to vote, just exactly as he pleases, and there is no man to molest him, no man to terrify him, no man even to complain of him. Now, on the other hand, go into any state which has retained the principle of the inequality of man, and determined that it will retain

it to the last, and you will find the state where not even the native born citizen and slaveholder, certainly none but he, can express his opinion on the question whether the African is or is not a descendant of Ham, or whether he is equal or inferior to the white man, and if he be inferior, whether it is not therefore the duty of the white man to enslave him. No, "mum's the word" for freemen wherever slavery is retained and cherished.

Silence on matters of state, the absence of freedom of speech and of freedom of the press—what kind of freedom is that? Is there a man in Minnesota who would for one day consent to live in it if he were deprived of the right to hurrah for Lincoln and Hamlin, or hurrah for Douglas, to hurrah for freedom, or to hurrah for slavery, just as he liked? I think that these one hundred and eighty thousand people who inhabit here, would be seen moving right out east and west, into British North America, or into Kamtschatka, anywhere on the earth to get out of this luxuriant and beautiful valley, if any power, human or divine, should announce to them that henceforth they spoke and voted their real sentiments and their real choice at their peril of imprisonment or death. Now, fellow citizens, you need only look around through such a mass of American citizens as I can see before me, and you may go over all the free states in the Union, and you will find them every day of the week somewhere gathered together, expressing their opinions and preparing to declare their will just exactly as you are doing. Does this *happen* to be so? Is it mere chance? Is it, indeed, even man's work, or device, or contrivance, that in this land, on this side of the great lakes, on this side of the Atlantic ocean, on this side of the Pacific ocean, men may all meet or may all stay apart, may all speak, think, act, print, write and vote just exactly as they please, while there is no other land on the face of the earth where ten men can be assembled together to exercise the same rights without being dispersed by an armed band of soldiers? Does it *happen* to be so in the United States, or is it the result of that higher law controlling the destinies of races, of nations, of men, so as to bring out and perfect here the model of what I have described as the true constitution of society, of a self-governing people, on the principle of equal and exact justice to all classes and conditions of men? Manifestly it is not of man's device or contrivance, but it is the work of a superior power that

—— "shapes our ends,
Rough hew them how we will!"

Now, while we see how obviously this is the result of controlling necessity, in accordance with the very purpose of a benevolent Providence, how singular and strange it is that so much pains have been taken by ourselves to defeat and prevent the organization and perfection of this very system of government among us! What has not the nation seen done and permitted to be done in the federal council at Washington? They have permitted statutes to be made and judgments to be rendered in their name, declaring that men are not freemen, but that in certain conditions, and in certain places, they are merchandise. The supreme court of the United States of America never rises without recording judgments and directing executions for the sale of men, women and children as merchandise; and this is done in your name and mine. The constitution never declared, never intended to declare, was never by its framers understood to declare, that any man could be a chattel or merchandise. All that it did declare was that all men should have rights to personal security and personal liberty within the action of the federal government. You see how we have had new religious systems established among us, teaching that the African slaves among us, nay, all Africans, are the children of an accursed parent, who was cursed not only in his own person and in his own day and generation, but in all his generations, and teaching that everybody had a right to curse anew these accursed generations to the end of time. We have had religious creeds established among us, that it is our duty to capture and return to slavery slaves escaping from their owners, because, they say, St. Paul sent back Onesimus, as they say, to his master—even teaching that it is the duty of men and a free state, not only to submit to laws passed for the purpose of extending human bondage, but even personally to execute them. You have seen how, in a portion of the Union, the great governing race, the white man, actually deprive themselves in a large degree of the advantages of education and instruction for greater security of keeping slaves in ignorance, so that schools and colleges and universities, as they are organized and perfected in the free states, and now in most of the states in western Europe, are, if not unpopular, yet feebly maintained in the slave states. You have seen how we have, in order to counteract the policy of our forefathers, surrendered in 1820 the state of Missouri, and all that part of the territory of Louisiana that lies south of 36° 30′, to slavery, and contented ourselves with saving to

freedom what lay north of that line; and you have seen how, only forty years afterward, in order to counteract and entirely defeat the policy of the fathers in establishing such institutions as those, we surrendered and gave up the whole of what we had saved in 1820, abandoning Kansas and the whole of our possessions from one end of the continent to the other, to be made slave colonies and slave states, if slave owners could make them so, and agreeing that we would receive them into the Union, as we had already agreed to receive four slave states out of Texas, to the end that this government might not continue to be, and develop itself to be a government founded on the equality of man, but should be and remain forever a government founded on the principle of property in man. You have seen, within the last thirty years, how the congress of the United States, in order to defeat this great policy, has suppressed, for a period of nearly ten years, freedom of debate and the right of petition on the subject of slavery in the house of representatives and in the senate of the United States. You know now how the mails of the United States are subject to espionage, to the end that any paper, or letter, or writing that shall argue for freedom against slavery, shall be abstracted and destroyed and withdrawn in order to fortify the power of slavery. You have seen the federal government connive and coöperate and combine with the slave party in endeavoring to force slavery on the people of Kansas when they had refused to accept it Did I say that you have seen all these things done? I am sorry to say that most of you have, at some time of your lives, given your consent by your voices, and even your votes, that they should be done. They are our own work.

The American people have adopted these measures to counteract and subvert the very principle of freedom established by the constitution. And now, since so much has been done, let us see what is the result after all, what advantage has slavery got, and what has freedom lost. While we have for forty years given our free consent that freedom should be stripped of everything, and that slavery should be invested with all power and domination, why they have arrested the march of emancipation at the line of Pennsylvania, and have left the ancient slavery still lingering in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, and they have added to them five or six slave states in the southwestern angle of the United States. That is all that they have done, and on the other

hand the great vital principle of the republic—this principle of freedom and equality—what has it not done? It has abolished slavery in seven of the original slave states, and has produced new and strong and most vigorous and virtuous states, all along the shores of the great lakes, and all across to the valley of the Upper Mississippi, and it has established freedom beyond the power of being overthrown, on the coast of the Pacific ocean. Certainly, since we can lay so little claim to having produced these results by our own work or wisdom or virtue, what could have secured them but that overruling Power, which, by its higher laws, controls even the perverse wills of men, and which means nothing less than that this shall be, henceforth and forever as it was established in the beginning—a land not of slavery, but a land of freedom.

Either in one way or the other, whether you agree with me in attributing it to the interposition of Divine Providence or not, this battle has been fought—this victory has been won. Slavery to-day is for the first time not only powerless, but without influence in the American republic. The serried ranks of party after party which rallied around it to sustain and support it, are broken under the irresistible pressure of a new party, organized to restore freedom to its original and just position in the government. For the first time in the history of the United States, no man in a free state can be bribed to vote for slavery. The government of the United States has not the power to make good a bribe or a seduction by which to convert whigs or democrats to support slavery. For the first time in the history of the republic, the slave power has not even the ability to terrify or alarm the freeman so as to make him submit, or even to compromise. It rails now with a feeble voice, instead of thundering as it did in our ears for twenty or thirty years past. With a feeble and muttering voice they cry out that they will tear the Union to pieces. They complain that if we will not surrender our principles, and our system, and our right, being a majority, to rule, and if we will not accept their system and such rulers as they will give us, they will go out of the Union. "Who's afraid[1]?" Nobody's afraid. Nobody can be bought. Now, fellow citizens, let me ask you, since you are so prompt at answering, suppose at any time within the last forty years we could have found the American people in the free states everywhere just as they are in the free

[1] Here hundreds of voices responded, "Nobody!"

states now, in such a frame of mind that there was no party that could be bought, nobody that could be scared—how much sooner do you think this revolution would have come in which we are now engaged? I do not believe there has been one day from 1787 until now when slavery had any power in the government, except what it derived from buying up men of weak virtue, little principle and great cupidity, and terrifying men of weak nerves in the free states.

And now I ask what has made this great political change? How is it that the American people who, only ten years ago, said, "Take part if you will, take all if you must," who, only six years ago, said, "Take Kansas, carry slavery over it peacefully if you can, forcibly if you must," who, when the widow's lament and the blood of the martyrs of liberty cried out from the ground and appealed to them for help and sympathy, announced, "Let Kansas shriek,"—how is it that in the space of six years you have all become the whole people of the north and of the northwest, the whole people of the free states have become all at once so honest that none of them can be bought, so brave that none of them can be terrified? I will tell you. Theorists and visionaries on the Atlantic coast, who, of all men in the world, were safest from the invasion of slavery, and had least to suffer from it, while these prairies and fields and wildernesses were as yet being filled up and unorganized, could not be convinced of the imminence of the danger. It has been next to impossible to convince the man who lives on the sidewalk in an Atlantic city, or even the farmer in his field in Ontario, or Cayuga, or Berks, or Windham, or Suffolk, or any one of the counties of the eastern states, that it was a matter of very great consequence whether slaves or freemen constitute the people, the ruling powers of the new states. But just in the right moment when the battle was as good as lost, the immigration from the eastern states and from the old world, into Michigan and Wisconsin and Minnesota and Iowa, rose up in the exercise and enjoyment of that freedom which had been saved to them by the ordinance of 1787, and appreciating its value and importance, and feeling every man for himself that he neither would be a slave, nor make a slave, nor own a slave, nor allow any other man to make or buy or own a slave within the state to which they belonged. They came like the army of Blucher to the rescue, and the field of Waterloo was won. The northwest has vindicated the wisdom of the statesmen of 1787, and the virtue of the Ameri-

can people; and now, since you were so determined that slavery should be arrested, and that freedom should henceforth be national and slavery only sectional, we of the Atlantic states are becoming just as honest and just as brave as you are.

But I must not be misinterpreted. I have said that this battle was fought and this victory won. I said so in the senate of the United States four years ago, and I was thought to have thereby been demoralizing instead of encouraging the great army of freedom to consummate its triumph. I knew better. I knew that men work all the better and all the braver when they have hope and confidence of success and triumph instead of contending under the influence of despondency or despair. This battle is fought and this victory is won, provided nevertheless that you remain determined to maintain the great republican party under its great and glorious leader, Abraham Lincoln, in inaugurating its principles into the administration of the government, and provided you stand by him in his administration, if it shall be, as I trust it will, a wise and just and good one, until the adversary shall find out that he has been beaten, and shall voluntarily retire from the field. Unless you do that there still is danger that all that has been gained may be lost.

There is one danger remaining—one only. Slavery can never more force itself, or be forced, from the stock that exists among us into the territories of the United States. But the cupidity of trade and the ambition of those whose interests are identified with slavery, are such that they may clandestinely and surreptitiously reöpen, either within the forms of law or without them, the African slave trade, and may bring in new cargoes of African slaves at one hundred dollars a head, and scatter them into the territories, and once getting possession of new domain they may again renew their operations against the patriotism of the American people. Therefore it is I enjoin upon you all to regard yourselves as men who, although you have achieved the victory and are entitled even now, it seems, to laurels, are nevertheless enlisted for the war and for your natural lives. You are committed to maintain the great policy until it shall have been so firmly established in the hearts and wills and affections of the American people, that there shall never be again a departure from it. We look to you of the northwest to finally decide whether this is to be a land of slavery or of freedom. The people of the northwest are to be the arbiters of its destiny; the virtue that is to

save the nation must reside in the northwest, for the simple reason that it is not the people who live on the sidewalks and who deal in merchandise on the Atlantic or the Pacific coasts, that exercise the power of government, of sovereignty, in the United States. The political power of the United States resides in the owners of the land of the United States. The owners of workshops and of the banks are in the east, and the owners of the gold mines are in the far west; but the owners of the land of the United States are to be found along the shores of the Mississippi river, from New Orleans to the source of the great river and the great lakes. On both sides of the noble flood are the people who hold in their hands the destinies of the republic.

I have been asked by many of you what I think of Minnesota. I will not enlarge further than to say, that Minnesota must be either a great state or a mean one, just as her people shall have wisdom and virtue to decide. That some great states are to be built up in the Mississippi valley, I know. You will no longer hereafter hear of the "Old Dominion" state. Dominion has been passing away from Virginia long ago. Pennsylvania is no longer the "Keystone" of the American Union, for the arch has been extended from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific ocean, and the center of the arch is moved westward also; a new keystone is to be inserted in that arch. New York will cease to be the "Empire State," and a new Empire State will grow up in a northern latitude, where the lands are rich, and where the people who cultivate them are all free and all equal; where the wealth of the continent is made, not where it is exchanged. That state which shall be truest to the great fundamental principle of the government, the principle of equality, that state which shall be most faithful, most vigorous in developing and perfecting society on this principle, will be at once the New Dominion State, the new Keystone State, the new Empire State. If there is any state in the northwest that has been kinder to me than the state of Minnesota, and if such a consideration could influence me, then I perhaps might have a sympathy with the emulation of some other state. I will only say that every man who has an honest heart and a clear head, can see that these proud distinctions are within the grasp of the people of Minnesota, and every generous heart will be willing to give her a fair chance to secure them.

THE NATIONAL IDEA; ITS PERILS AND TRIUMPHS.

CHICAGO, OCTOBER 3, 1860.

HAIL to the state of Illinois! whose iron roads form the spinal column of that system of internal continental trade which surpasses all the foreign commerce of the country, and has no parallel or imitation in any other country on the face of the globe.

Hail to Chicago! the heart which supplies life to this great system of railroads—Chicago, the last and most wonderful of all the marvelous creations of civilization in North America.

Hail to this council chamber of the great republican party! justly adapted, by its vastness and its simplicity, to its great purposes—the hall where the representatives of freemen framed that creed of republican faith which carries healing for the relief of a disordered nation. Woe! woe! be to him who shall add or shall subtract one word from that simple, sublime, truthful, beneficent creed.[1]

Hail to the representatives of the republican party! chosen here by the republicans of the United States, and placed upon the platform of that creed. Happy shall he be who shall give them his suffrage. If he be an old man, he shall show the virtue of wisdom acquired by experience. If he be a young man, he shall in all his coming years tell his fellow men with pride, "I, too, voted for Abraham Lincoln."

That republican creed is nevertheless no partisan creed. It is a national faith, because it is the embodiment of the one life sustaining, life-expanding idea of the American republic. What is the idea more or less than simply this: That civilization is to be maintained and carried on upon this continent by federal states, based upon the principles of free soil, free labor, free speech, equal rights, and universal suffrage?

This is no new idea. This idea had its first utterance, and the boldest and clearest of all the utterances it has ever received, in the

[1] See Memoir, ante, page 76.

very few words that were spoken by this nation when it came before the world, took its place upon the stage of human action, asserted its independence in the fear of God, and in full confidence of the approval of mankind, and declared that henceforth it held those to be its enemies who should oppose it in war, and those to be its friends who should maintain with it relations of peace. That utterance was expressed in these simple words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal, and have the inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." This great national idea has been working out its fruits ever since. Its work is seen in the perfect acceptance of it by eighteen of the thirty-four states of the Union—or seventeen of the thirty-three, if Kansas is to be considered out. It is asserting itself in the establishment of new states throughout the west, as it has revolutionized and is revolutionizing all of western and southern Europe. Why is this idea so effective? It is because it is the one chief living, burning, inextinguishable thought of human nature itself, entertained by man in every age and in every clime.

This national idea works not unopposed. Every good and virtuous and benevolent principle in nature has its antagonist, and this great national idea works in perpetual opposition—I may be allowed to say in irrepressible conflict—with an erroneous, a deceitful, a delusive idea. Do you ask what that delusive idea is? It is the idea that civilization ought and can be effected on this continent by this same form of federal states, based on the principles of slave labor—of African slave labor, of unequal rights and unequal representation, resulting in unequal suffrage.

Can it be that this great creed of ours needs exposition or defense? It seems to me so evidently just and true, that it requires no exposition and needs no defense. Certainly in foreign countries it needs none. In Scotland, or France, or Germany, or Russia, on the shores of the Mediterranean, in Europe, or in Asia, or in Africa, you will never find one human being who denies the truth and the justice of this our national idea of the equality of men. It needs no exposition anywhere. It is one of those propositions that when addressed to thoughtful men needs no explanation or defense. And why not?

Here we can see for ourselves this mean and miserable stream of black African slavery stealing along, turbid and muddy, as it is drawn from its stagnant source in the slave states; we see that it is pesti-

lential in the atmosphere it passes through; we can see how inadequate it is and unfit to irrigate a whole continent with the living waters of health and life; we can see how it is that everything within its sphere withers and droops; while on the other hand, we can also see free labor as it descends the mountain sides in torrents, is then gathered in rivulets, which, increasing always in volume and power, spread all over the land. We can well see, by the effects it has already produced, how it irrigates and must continue to irrigate this whole continent; how every good and virtuous thing lives and breathes by its support. We see the magical fertility which results from its presence, because it is around us and before us.

We sometimes hear an argument for a political proposition made in this form: One offers to "take a thing to be done by the job." Let us imagine for a moment that there could be one man bold enough, great enough, and wise enough to take "by the job" the work of establishing civilization over this broad continent of North America. He would of course want to do it in the shortest time, at the cheapest expense and in the best manner. Now, would such a contractor ever dream of importing African barbarians, or of taking their children or descendants in this country to build up and people great free states all over this land, from the Alleghany mountains to the Pacific ocean? Would he not, on the contrary, accept, as the rightful, natural, healthful and best possible agency which he could select, the free labor of free men, the minds, the thoughts, the wills, the purposes, the ambitions of enlightened freemen, such as we claim ourselves to be? Would he not receive all who claimed to aid in such services as these, whether they were born on this soil or cradled in foreign lands?

I care not when reckless men say, in the heat of debate, or under the influence of interest, passion or prejudice, that it is a matter of indifference whether slavery shall pervade the whole land, or a part of the land, and freedom the residue; that freedom and slavery may take their chances; that they "don't care whether slavery is voted up or down." There is no man who has an enlightened conscience who is indifferent on the subject of human bondage. There is no man who is enlightened and honest, who would not abate part of his worldly wealth, if he could thereby convert this land from a land cursed in whole or in part with slavery, into a land of equal and impartial liberty. And I will tell you how I know this: I know it

because every man demands freedom for himself, and refuses to be a slave. No free man, who is a man, would consent to be a slave. Every slave who has any manhood in him desires to be free; every man who has an unperverted reason, laments, condemns and deplores the practice of commerce in man. The executioner is always odious, even though his task is necessary to the administration of justice. We turn with horror and disgust from him who wields the ax. So the slaveholder turns with disgust from the auctioneer who sells the man and woman whom he has reared and held in slavery, although he receives the profits of the sale into his own coffers.

I know this national idea of ours is just and right for another reason. It is that in the whole history of society human nature has never, never honored one man who reduced another man to bondage. The world is full of monuments in honor of men who have delivered their fellow men from slavery.

Since this idea is self-evidently just, and is of itself pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated and full of good works, will you tell me why it is that it has not been fully accepted by the American people? Alas! that it should be so. Perhaps I can throw light on that by asking another question. Is not Christianity pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated and full of good works? and yet is not the church of Jesus Christ still a church militant? Alas! that it should be so. Christianty explains for herself how it is that she is rejected of men. She says it is because men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. I shall not say this in regard to the subject of freedom. I know better. I know that my countrymen love light, not darkness. They are even in the state and disposition of the Roman governor, "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," and almost the American people are persuaded to be republicans. Why, then, are they not *altogether* persuaded? The answer cannot be given without some reflection. It involves an examination of our national conduct and life.

The reason why the country is only almost and not altogether persuaded to be republican, is because the national sense and judgment have been perverted. We inherited slavery; it is organized into our national life—into our forms of government. It exists among us, unsuspected in its evils, because we have become accustomed, by national habit, to endure and tolerate slavery. The effect of this habit arising from the presence of slavery, is to produce a

want of moral courage among the people and an indisposition to entertain and examine the subject. It is not, however, the fault of the people. This lack of moral courage is chiefly the fault of the political representatives of the people. In every district in the United States, and for every seat in congress, the people might select men apparently as brave, as truthful, as fearless and as firm as Owen Lovejoy. Yet, you may fill the halls of congress with men from all the free states who seem to be as reliable as Owen Lovejoy; but on the clangor of the slavery bugle in the hall they begin to waver and fail. They retire. They suffer themselves to be demoralized; and they return to demoralize the people. Slavery never hesitates to raise the clangor of the trumpets to terrify the timid.

Slavery has, too, another argument for the timid; it is power. The concentration of slavery gives it a fearful political power. You know how long it has been the controlling power in the executive department of the government. Slavery uses that power, as might be expected—to punish those who oppose it, to reward those who serve it. All representatives are naturally ambitious; all representatives like fame; if they do not like pecuniary rewards, they like the distinctions of place. They like to be popular. When the people are demoralized, he who is constant becomes offensive and obnoxious; he loses position and the party chooses some other representative who will be less obnoxious. These demoralized representatives inculcate among the people pernicious lessons and sustain themselves by adopting compromises. They compromise so far, if possible, as to save place and a show of principle; they save themselves first, and let freedom take her chances.

A community thus demoralized by its representatives is fearful of considering the subject of slavery at all. It does not like to look back upon its record; it does not dare to look forward to see what are to be the consequences of errors. It desires peace and quiet. We shall see in a moment what fearful sacrifices have been made under the influence of this demoralization by the power of the government.

The first act of demoralization was to surrender the territory of Arkansas and the territory of Missouri to slavery, and also by implication all the rest of the territory of Louisiana acquired by purchase from France, that lay south of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude. Take up your maps when you go home,

and observe what a broad belt of country, lying south of that line, was surrendered, with the states of Missouri and Arkansas, to slavery. Next, under the influence of this same demoralization, the whole of the peninsula of Florida acquired from Spain, was surrendered to slavery, rendering it practically useless for all the national purposes for which it was acquired, making it a burden instead of a blessing, a danger instead of a national safe-guard in the gulf of Mexico.

Then Texas was surrendered to slavery and brought in with the gratuitous agreement that four slave states should be made out of that territory. Next, in 1850, Utah and New Mexico were abandoned to slavery. After these events, following in quick succession, came the abrogation, in the year 1854, of the restriction contained in the Missouri compromise, by which it had been stipulated that all north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, excepting the state of Missouri, should be dedicated to freedom. That was abandoned to slavery to take it if she could get it; and the administration of the government of the United States, with scarcely a protest from the people, went on to favor its occupation by slavery. As a legitimate consequence came the refusal, on the part of the national government—for it was a practical refusal—to admit Kansas into the Union because she would not accept slavery.

After these measures, what right had the nation to be surprised when the president and the supreme court at last pronounced that which in no previous year either of them would have dared to assert—that this constitution of ours is not a constitution of liberty, but that it is a constitution of human bondage; that slavery is the normal condition of the American people on each acre of the domain of the United States not organized into states—that is to say, that wherever this banner of ours, this star spangled banner, whose glories we celebrate so highly—wherever that banner floats over a national ship or a national territory, there is a land, not of freedom, but of slavery!

Thus it has happened, that the nation up to 1854 surrendered all the unoccupied portions of this continent to slavery, and thereby practically excluded freemen—because experience shows that when you have made a slave territory, freedom avoids it; just as much as when you make a free state, like Kansas, slavery disappears from it.

I have said that the country was demoralized by its political representatives; but these political representatives have their agents. All men necessarily fall into some political party, and into some political parties and religious sects. To gain office in a political party and share its favors, when the nation was demoralized it became necessary that the candidate should be tolerant of slavery. So religious sects were ambitious to extend their ecclesiastical sway. The consequence was that year by year slavery had always a party; slavery had religious sect upon religious sect; church after church. But alas! until the dawn of that memorable year 1854 freedom had no party and no religious sect throughout this whole country.

A people who are demoralized are every day more easily operated upon; they are easily kept persistently in the same erroneous habit which has demoralized them. The first practice for continuing to extend the power of slavery upon this continent, is that of alarm. Fears of all kinds are awakened in the public mind. The chief of them is the fear of turbulence, of disorder, of civil commotions, and of civil war. The slaveholders in the slave states very justly, and truthfully, and rightfully assume that slaves are the natural enemies of their masters; and, of course, that slaves are insidious enemies of the state which holds them, or requires them to be held in bondage; that insidious enemies are dangerous; and, therefore, in every slave state that has ever been founded in this country, a policy is established which suppresses freedom of speech and freedom of debate, so far as liberty needs advocates, while it extends the largest license of debate to those who advocate the interests of slavery. This lack of freedom of speech and freedom of debate is followed in slave states by the necessary consequence, that there is no freedom of suffrage. So that at the last presidential election—the first when this question was ever distinctly brought before the American people—there were no slave states in which a ballot-box was open for freedom, or where free men might cast their ballots with safety. If one side only is allowed to vote in a state, it is very easy to see that that side must prevail.

If the condition of civil society is such that voting is not to be done safely, few men will vote. Every man who wishes, perhaps only consents, to express his choice is not expected to be a martyr. The world produces but few men willing to be martyrs, my friends, and I am sorry to say they have not been very numerous in our

day. Nearly one-half of the United States, then—that is, all the slave states—are at once to be arrayed on the side of slavery; and behold then! they tell us that republicanism, which invites them to discuss the subject, is sectional, and they are national. But the slave states are not willing to rest content with this exclusion of all freedom of suffrage, of speech and of debate on the subject of slavery within their own jurisdiction, but they require the free states to accept the same system for themselves. They insist that although they may be able at home to keep down their slaves if we will be quiet, yet they cannot tolerate a discussion of slavery in the free states, as we thereby encourage the slaves in the slave states to insurrection and sedition. Lest this argument might fail to reach and convince us, inasmuch as we, ourselves, are safe from any danger to result from insurrection in the slave states, they bring it home to our fears by declaring that their peace is of more importance than the interest of the nation; that they prefer slavery even to Union; that if we will not acquiesce in allowing them to maintain, fortify and extend slavery, then they will dissolve the Union, and we must all go down together, or all suffer a common desolation. There are few men—and there ought to be few—who would be so intent on the subject of establishing freedom that they would consent to a subversion of the Union to produce it, because the Union is a positive benefit, nay, an absolute necessity, and to save the Union, men may naturally dare to delay. Most men, therefore, very cheerfully prefer to let the subject of slavery rest for some better time—for some better occasion—for some more fortunate circumstance, and they are content to keep the Union with slavery if it cannot be kept otherwise.

You see how this has worked in demoralizing the American people. Less than thirty years ago the governor of Massachusetts —that first and freest of the states—actually recommended the legislature to pass laws which would delare that the meetings of citizens held to discuss the subject of slavery should be deemed seditious, and should be dissolved by the police! The governor of the state of New York, who preceded me in that high office, during his administration, and within your own lifetime and mine, actually made the same recommendation to the legislature of that state. What was recommended, but not carried out in those states by law, became a custom and practice; for, as you know, when the laws did not

dissolve the public assembly, there was a period of near twenty years in which no meeting of men opposed to the extension or aggrandizement of slavery, could be held without being dispersed by the mob, acting in harmony with the general opinion of the country.

When the people of the free states were thus demoralized, what wonder is it, that for twelve years all debate in congress on the subject of slavery or the presentation of the subject by the people even in the form of a petition, was repressed and trampled under foot, and remained there until John Quincy Adams at last rallied a party around him, strong enough to restore freedom of debate in the house of representatives! What wonder is it that within the last year, in the very face of the organization, and the onward march of the republican party, the administration of the federal government has actually, by its officers, appointed in compliance with the dictation of the slaveholders, abandoned the federal mails to the inspection and surveillance of the magistrates of the slave states; so that they may abstract and commit to the flames every word that any statesman may speak, however eloquent, able, truthful or moderate, in the halls of congress against slavery and in favor of freedom.

This, fellow citizens, is your government. This is the condition in which you are placed, I am sorry to say—but I like to be truthful—that I have no especial compliments for you of the state of Illinois, on this subject; for in this long catalogue of extraordinary concessions to slavery, under the influence of fear, I think the very first protest that ever came from the state of Illinois was as late as the year 1855; after all the most atrocious concessions had been made. You sent two senators to congress; you insisted upon extending the Wilmot proviso over the territory acquired from Spain. How did they do it? They voted for the Wilmot proviso under your instructions, and they voted against it without instructions, when it came to the practical test. I think you made no protest until Mr. Douglas demanded one single and last concession "for the purpose," as he said, "of excluding the whole subject from congress." That was the abrogation of the Missouri compromise, containing the restrictions for the protection of freedom in the territories of Kansas and Nebraska. Then you sent a noble representative to the senate in the person of Judge Trumbull.

I marveled when I rose here before you to-day and saw this immense assemblage, which no edifice, but only the streets, of Chicago

could hold, and I wondered how it would have been had I come here in 1850, or even at any later day before the abrogation of the Missouri compromise.

But let by-gones be by-gones. I have seen the time when I had as little courage and as little resolution on this subject as most of you. I was born into the demoralization—I was born a slaveholder, and have some excuse, which you have not. All these things were done, not because you loved slavery, but because you loved the Union.

When slavery became identical in the public mind with the Union, how natural it was, even for patriotic men, to approve of, or to at least excuse and tolerate slavery. How odious did it become for men to be freesoilers, and be regarded as abolitionists, when to be an abolitionist was, in the estimation of mankind, to be a traitor to one's country, and to such a country as this is. How natural was it then to believe that slavery after all might not be so very bad, and to believe that it might be necessary and might be right at some times, or on some occasions, which times and occasions were always a good way off from themselves; especially, how natural was it, when the whole Christian church, with all its sects, bent itself to the support of the Union, mistaking the claim of slavery for the cause of the Union.

How extensive this proscription for the sake and in the name of Union, has been and is to this day, you will see at once when I tell you that there is not in this whole republic, from one end of it to the other, a man who maintains that slavery shall not be extended, who can secure, at the hands of his country, any part in the administration of its government from a tide-waiter in the custom house, or a postmaster in a rural district, to a secretary of state, a minister in a foreign court, or a president of the United States. How could you expect that a people, every one of whom is born with a possible chance and a fair expectation of being something—perhaps president of the United States—would resist the demoralization prosecuted by such means? And when it becomes a heresy, for which a man is deprived of position in an ecclesiastical sect to which he belongs, how could you expect that the members of the Christian churches would be bold enough to provoke the censure of the Christian world? Above all, our constitution, as we have always supposed, was so framed that it gave us a judiciary which cannot err,

which must be infallible, and must not be disputed; and when the judicial authority, which has the army and the navy, through the direction of the executive power, to execute its judgments and decrees, pronounces that every appeal made for freedom is seditious, that every syllable in defense of liberty is treason, and the natural sympathy we feel for the oppressed is to be punished as a crime; while that authority is unwilling, or at least unable to bring to punishment one single culprit out of the thousand of pirates who bring away slaves from Africa to sell in foreign lands—how could you expect a simple agricultural people, such as we are, to be so much wiser and better than our presidents and vice-presidents, senators and representatives in congress, and even our judges?

I have brought you down to the time when this demoralization was almost complete. How assured its ultimate success seemed, after the compromise of 1850, you will learn from a fact which I have never before mentioned, but which I will now: Horace Mann, one of the noblest champions of freedom on this continent, confessed to me, after the passage of the slavery laws of that year, that he despaired of the cause of humanity. In 1854, after the repeal of the Missouri compromise, without producing so much alarm as a considerable thunder storm would do in the nation, there was only one man left who hoped against the prevailing demoralization, and who cheered and sustained me through it; and that man, in his zeal to make his prediction just, was afterwards betrayed so far by his zeal that he became ultimately a monomaniac, and suffered on the gallows. That was John Brown. The first and only time I ever saw him was when he called upon me after the abrogation of the Missouri compromise, and asked me what I thought of the future. I said I was disappointed and saddened—I would persevere, but it was against hope. He said, "Cheer up, governor; the people of Kansas will not accept slavery; Kansas will never be a slave state."

I took then a deliberate survey of the broad field; I considered all; I examined and considered all the political forces which were revealed to my observation. I saw that freedom in the future states of this continent was the necessity of this age, and of this country. I saw that the establishment of this as a republic, conservative of the rights of human nature, was the cause of the whole world; and I saw that the time had come when men, and women, and children were departing from their homes in the eastern states, and were fol-

lowed or attended by men, women and children from the European nations—all of them crowded out by the pressure of population upon subsistence in the older parts of the world, and all making their way up the Hudson river, through the Erie canal, along the railroads, by the way of the lakes, spreading themselves in a mighty flood over Michigan, Iowa, Indiana and Illinois, and even to the banks of the Mississippi. I knew that these emigrants were planting a town every day, and a state every three years, heedless and unconcerned as they were, thinking only of provision for their immediate wants, shelter and lands to till in the west—I knew an interest yet unknown to themselves, which they would have when they should get here, and that was, that they should own the land themselves —that slaves should not come into competition with them here.

So, as they passed by me, steamboat load after steamboat load, and railroad train after railroad train, though they were the humblest and perhaps the least educated and least trained portion of the communities from which they had come, I knew that they had the instinct of interest, and below, and deeper than that, the better instinct of justice. And I said, I will trust these men; I will trust these exiles; my faith and reliance henceforth is on the poor, not on the rich; on the humble, not on the great. Aye, and sad it was to confess, but it was so. I said, henceforth I put my trust, in this case, not in my native countrymen, but I put it in the exile from foreign lands. He has an abhorrence for, and he has never been accustomed to slavery by habit. Here he will stay and retain these territories free.

I was even painfully disappointed at first, in seeing that the emigrants to the west had no more consciousness of their interest in this question when they arrived here than they had in their native countries. The Irishman who had struggled against oppression in his own country, failed me; the German seemed at first—but, thank God, not long—dull and unconscious of the duty that had devolved upon him. This is true; but nevertheless I said that the interest and instincts of these people would ultimately bring them out, and when the states which they found and rear and fortify, shall apply for admission into the Federal Union, they will come, not as slave states, but as free states.

I looked one step further. I saw how we could redeem all that had been lost; and redeem it, too, by appealing to the very passions and interests that had lost all.

The process was easy. The slave states of the south had demoralized the free states of the north by giving them presidencies, secretaryships, foreign missions and post offices. And now, here in the northwest, we will build up more free states than there are slave states. Those free states having a common interest in favor of freedom, equal to that of the southern slave states in favor of slavery, will offer to Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Jersey, objects worthy their ambition. And to-day I see the very realization of it all. I can give you advocates for freedom in the northern states, as bold, as outspoken, as brave and as confident of the durability of the Union, as you can find for slavery in the southern states. Aye, and when the southern states try to demoralize the free states by saying they will give their trade and traffic, will buy silks and linens and other trumpery, provided they can buy their principles in the sale, and the bargain must be struck, I said there shall be, in those new free states in the northwest, men who will say, we will buy your silks and linens and your trumpery of every sort; we will even buy more, and pay you quite as well, provided you do not betray your principles.

All this was simply restoring the balance of the republican system, bringing in a proper force in favor of freedom to counteract the established political agencies of slavery. You have heard that I have said that the last democrat is born in this nation. I say so, however, with the qualification before used, that by democrat I mean one who will maintain the *democratic* principles which constitute the present creed of the democratic party; and for the reason, a very simple one, that slavery cannot pay any longer, and the democrat does not work for anybody who does not pay. I propose to pay all kinds of patriots hereafter, just as they come. I propose to pay them fair consideration if they will only be true to freedom. I propose to gratify all their aspirations for wealth and power, as much as the slave states can.

But, fellow citizens, we had no party for this principle. There was the trouble. Democracy was the natural ally of slavery in the south. We were either whigs, or, if you please, Americans, some of us, and thank God I never was one, in the limited sense of the term. But the whig party or the American party, if not equally an ally of the slave party in the south, was, at least, a treacherous and unreliable party for the interests of freedom. Only one thing was

wanting, that was to dislodge from the democratic party, the whig party and the native American party, men enough to constitute a republican party—a party of freedom.

And for that we are indebted to the kindness, unintentional, no doubt, of your distinguished senator, now a candidate for the presidency, Mr. Douglas, who, in procuring the abrogation of the Missouri compromise, so shattered the columns of these parties as to disintegrate them, and instantly there was the material, the preparation for the onslaught.

Still there was wanted an occasion, and that occasion was given when, in an hour of madness, the democratic party and administration, with the sympathy, or at least the acquiescence, of the old line whigs and the native Americans, refused to allow the state of Kansas to exercise the perfect freedom in choosing between liberty and slavery, which they had promised to her, except she should exercise it in favor of slavery. Then came the hour. We had then the cause for a party, the material for a party, and we had the occasion for a party, and the republican party sprang into existence at once, full armed. I will never knowingly do evil that good may come of it; I will never even wish that others may do evil that good may come of it; and for the same reason that I know the evil to be certain, and the good only possible or problematical. But no man ever rejoiced more heartily over the birth of his first born than I did when I saw the folly and madness of the repeal of the Missouri compromise and the rejection of Kansas. This act, I said to myself, is the doing of presidents, of senators, of judges, of priests and of deacons; and when the republican party organized itself, I said now is the preparation for the work complete.

How much I have been cheered in this long contest by seeing that only stolen, surreptitious advantages were gained by slavery in the form of rescripts and edicts and laws on the statute book; while the cause of freedom brought in first California; next, New Mexico, with her constitution claiming freedom; next, Kansas; next, Minnesota, and next, Oregon. You may all know, if possibly you remember, the song of joy, not so poetic, but as full of truth and exultation as the song of Miriam, which I then uttered, declaring that the battle was ended and the victory was won. The battle is ended and the victory is ours. Why, then, say they, why not withdraw from the field? For the simple reason that if the victor retire

from the field, the vanquished will then come back, and the battle will not be won. Why should the victor withdraw and surrender all his conquests to the conquered enemy? Why should he invite the enemy back upon the field, and withdraw his own legions into the far distance, to give him a chance to reëstablish the line that has been broken up?

The republican party will now complete this great revolution. I know it will, because, in the first place, it clearly perceives its duties. It is unanimous upon this subject. We have had hesitation heretofore, but the creed to which I have already adverted, which issued from that council chamber now before me, announces the true determination, and embodies that great, living, national idea of freedom, with which I began. I know that the republican party will do it, because it finds the necessary forces in all the free states adequate, I trust, to achieve success, and has forces in reserve, and increasing in every slave state in the Union, and only waiting until the success of the republican party in the free states shall be such as to warrant protection to debate, and free suffrage in the slave states. But, above all, I know it, because the republican party has, what is necessary in every revolution, chosen the right line of policy. It is the policy of peace and moral suasion; of freedom and suffrage; the policy, not of force, but of reason. It returns kindness for unkindness, fervently increased loyalty for demonstrations of disloyalty; patience as becomes the strong, in contention with the weak.

It leaves the subject of slavery in the slave states to the care and responsibility of the slave states alone, abiding by the constitution of the country, which makes the slave states on this subject sovereign; and, trusting that the end cannot be wrong, provided that it shall confine itself within its legitimate line of duty, thereby making freedom paramount in the federal government, and making it the interest of every American citizen to sustain it as such. I know that the republican party will succeed in this, because it is a positive and an active party. It is the only party in the country that is or can be positive in its action. You have three other parties, or forms of parties, but each of them without the characteristics of a party. You are to choose. The citizen is to choose between the republican party and one of these.

Try them now by their candidates. Mr. Lincoln represents the republican party. He represents a party which has determined that

not one more slave shall be imported from Africa, or transferred from any slave state, domestic or foreign, and placed upon the common soil of the United States. If you elect him, you know, and the world knows, what you have got. Take the case of Mr. John Bell, an honorable man; a kind man, and a very learned man, a very patriotic man; a man whom I respect, and in social intercourse quite as much as everywhere else, as here where my word may be regarded as simply complimentary; but what does Mr. John Bell, and his constitutional Union—what is the name of his party? Constitutional Union, is it not? What do Mr. Bell and his constitutional Union party propose on this question? He proposes to ignore it altogether; not to know that there is such a question. If we can suppose such a thing possible as Mr. Bell's election by the people, what then? He ignored the question until the day of election came, but it will not stay ignored. Kansas comes and asks or demands to be admitted into the Union. The Indian territory, also, south of Kansas, must be vacated by the Indians, and here at once the slaveholders present the question as they will also do in the case of New Mexico. It will not stay ignored. It will not rest. It cannot rest. You have postponed the decision for four years, and that is all. Postponing does not settle it. When defending law suits, I have seen times when I thought I won a great advantage by getting an adjournment, but I always found, nevertheless, that it was a great deal better to be beaten in the first instance, and try it again, than to hang my hopes upon an adjournment.

Take the other: Mr. Breckinridge represents a party that proposes a policy the very opposite of ours. They propose to extend slavery and to use the federal government to do it. Let us suppose him elected. Will that satisfy the American people? Will that settle the question? That is only what Mr. Buchanan has already done. And if I should put a vote to this audience, I am sure I should get no vote of confidence in Mr. Buchanan. That is of course. But if I were to go into a Bell-and-Everett national Union party meeting, as vast as this, and ask for a vote of confidence in James Buchanan, they would say no, just as emphatically as you do. In the demonstration for Mr. Douglas, which is to be made here day after to-morrow—I shall not be here, and would not have the right to appear if I were—but any of you have the right, by their leave, and you ought not to do it without, to offer and put to vote a resolution

of confidence in James Buchanan, and you would get precisely the same negative response that you get here, only a little louder. Then the people are not going to elect Mr. Breckinridge, because he proposes to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Buchanan, who is rejected. Grant, however, that owing to some misapprehension, or some strange combination, they may obtain all they hope, and indirectly, if not directly, make Mr. Breckinridge president. Suppose Mr. Breckinridge elected. Does that settle the question in favor of slavery? Then you have the combination, not only of the republicans, and the constitutional Union party, but even of the Douglas party also, to drive him out again. So in that case, too, you have only postponed the question for four years more, under circumstances far more serious, possibly fatal.

You have now disposed of them all except the Douglas party. Mr. Douglas' party is not a positive party. It proposes just what the Bell party proposes—to ignore the question in congress. That is just what we find the people will not do, and will not be content to do under John Bell. Why should they like it better under Mr. Douglas? Mr. Douglas and his party say there is a better way. They don't want it ignored, but that it belongs to the territories, and the inhabitants there can settle it better and more wisely than we can. What can they do? Have they settled it in their territories in favor of slavery? Are you, the people of the free states, going to consent to that? If you were, why did you not consent to the proposition of the president, that the people of Kansas should be subjected to slavery under the Lecompton constitution? The president then said, that was the act of the people of Kansas. But if the people of the territory should decide in favor of freedom, are the slave states going to acquiesce? No, because they have their candidate in the person of Mr. Breckinridge to continue the war until they shall regain the lost battle.

But Mr. Douglas' proposition may result in a different way. He says, if I understand him rightly, that it is immaterial to him, at least he has no right and does not propose to decide upon the question, being indifferent whether they vote slavery up or down. Then they will vote slavery up in some territories, and vote it down in some other territories. That, fellow citizens, will be compromise; are you going to be satisfied with a new compromise? You have

tried compromises, and found that they are never kept. On the whole, you are very sorry that they were ever made.

But is a compromise that is brought about in that way, the irresponsible act of squatter sovereignty in the territories, to satisfy the slave states? They have repudiated Mr. Douglas, the ablest man among all their friends; they have repudiated him altogether, because they will not be satisfied with a squatter sovereignty that gives any territory whatever to the free states.

I have now demonstrated to you, I think, that the republican party is the only positive party. But I can show it by another argument. The republican party has one faith, one creed, one baptism, one candidate, and will have but one victory. The power of slavery has three creeds, three faiths, and is to have three victories. They have openly confessed, or rather the secret leaks out, through conversations and consultations, that they do not expect to get a single victory, any more than you expect they will. All their hope and endeavor is to defeat the republican party, and leave to chance the fruits to result from your defeat.

Suppose they should, by combinations and coalitions, secure the defeat of the republican party, are you going to stay defeated? You have been defeated once, have you not? Can you not bear another defeat? You will not have to, I am sure. But I am supposing for the purpose of argument that we are defeated by a coalition. Did any one ever know a cause that was lost when it was defeated by a coalition? There was a coalition in Europe five years ago, in which Hungary was defeated by the coalition of Austria with Russia; but Hungary has risen up again to-day, and the coalition is understood to be dissolved. There was a coalition two or three years later, in which Russia was defeated by the combination of France and England; but Russia is just as strong, just as steadily pressing on toward Constantinople to-day as she has been every day from the time of the Czar Peter until now. And while she has abated nothing of her purposes, and nothing of hope, she has gained strength. So, all the efforts of the statesmen of both France and England are required to keep them from falling out with each other before the renewed battle begins. There is no danger and not much disgrace in being beaten by coalitions; and there is no danger, because they are coalitions. The more that coalitions are necessary, the less are they effectual. One party is always stronger than two other

parties in a contest, unless the whole result is staked upon a single battle.

But the explanation of the whole matter is, that there is a time when the nation needs and will require and demand the settlement of subjects of contention. That time has come at last, which the parties in this country, both of the slaveholding states and of the free states, both the slaveholder and the free laboring man, will require an end—a settlement of the conflict. It must be repressed. The time has come to repress it. The people will have it repressed. They are not to be forever disputing upon old issues and controversies. New subjects for national action will come up. This controversy must be settled and ended. The republican party is the agent, and its success will terminate the contest about slavery in the new states. Let this battle be decided in favor of freedom in the territories, and not one slave will ever be carried into the territories of the United States, and that will end the irrepressible conflict.

And the fact that it is necessary that it should be done, is exactly the reason why it *will* be done. It cannot be settled otherwise, because it involves a question of justice and of conscience. It is for us not merely a question of policy, but a question of moral right and duty. It is wrong, in our judgment, to perpetuate by our votes or to extend slavery. It is a very different thing when the slaveholder proposes to extend slavery; for that is, with him, only a question of merchandise. Men, of whatever race or nation, in our estimation, are *men*, not merchandise. According to our faith, they all have a natural right to be men, but in the estimation of the other party, African slaves are not men, but merchandise. It is, therefore, nothing more or less with them than a tariff question; a question of protecting commerce. With us it is a question of human rights, and therefore when it is settled, and settled in favor of the right, it will stay settled just as every question that is settled in favor of the right always does.

But if it be taken merely as a question of policy, it is equally plain that it will be settled in favor of the republican side, because our highest policy is the development of the resources and the increase of the population, wealth and strength of the republic. Every man sees for himself, and no man need be told that the coal, the iron, the lead, the copper, the silver and the gold in our mountains and plains are to be dug out by the human hand, and that the only hand that can dig them is the hand of a freeman. Every man

sees that this wealth and strength and greatness are to be acquired by human labor, guided by human intelligence and human purpose. Every man knows that the slave, even if he be a white man, will have neither the strength, nor the intelligence, nor the virtue, nor even the purpose to create wealth; for the slave has a simple line of interest before him—it is to effect the least and consume the most.

But I seem to myself to have fallen below the dignity and greatness of this question, in discussing a proposition whether free labor or slave labor is more expedient, or more necessary. Let me rise once more, and remind you that we are building a new and great empire; not building it as modern Rome and Paris and Naples stand, upon the ruins and over the graves of tenfold greater multitudes of men than those who now occupy their sites; but upon a soil where we are the first possessors and the first architects. The tomb and the catacomb in Rome and Paris and Naples are filled with relics and implements of human torture and bondage, showing the ignorance and barbarity of their former occupants. Let us, on the other hand, while we build up an empire, take care that we leave no monument or relic in our graves, and no trace in our history, to prove that we were false to the great interests of humanity. Human nature is entitled to a home on this earth somewhere. Where else shall it be if it be not here? Human nature is entitled, among all the nations of the earth, to have a nation that will truly represent, defend and vindicate it. What other nation shall it be, if it be not ours?

People of Illinois! People of the great west! You are all youthful, vigorous, generous. Your states are youthful, vigorous and virtuous. The destinies of our country, the hopes of mankind, the hopes of humanity rest upon you. Ascend, I pray, I conjure you, to the dignity of that high responsibility! Thus acting, you will have peace and harmony and happiness in your future years. The world, looking on, will applaud you, and future generations in all ages and in all regions will rise up and call you blessed.

THE REPUBLICAN POLICY AND THE ONE IDEA.

DUBUQUE, SEPTEMBER 21, 1860.

I PROPOSE to speak to you on this occasion of what concerns us all; a great political question which is to be the subject of decision by the American people in the coming canvass. The policy of the federal government for forty years has been to extend and fortify African slave labor in the United States.

Many who have maintained the administration and the party who have carried out this policy, have been unconscious, doubtless, of the nature of the policy they maintained. But it is not a subject of dispute or cavil what has been the policy of the government of the country for forty years. I will give but one illustration. No man in the nation would have objected or could have objected to the admission of Texas into the Federal Union, provided it had been a free state. No man who objected could have objected but for the reason that she was not a slave state. When the question of annexing Texas tried all the existing parties, and puzzled, bewildered and confounded the statesmen of the country, the question was finally decided, in a short and simple way, by the declaration of the administration of John Tyler, made by Mr. Calhoun, his secretary of state, that Texas must be annexed because it was a slaveholding country —it must be annexed with the condition of subdividing it into four slave states. Texas must be annexed for the purpose of fortifying and defending the institution of slavery in the United States. This one single fact upon which the parties joined issue, is conclusive.

Now, it is our purpose to reverse this policy. Our policy, stated as simply as I have stated that of our adversaries, is, *to circumscribe slavery, and to fortify and extend free labor or freedom.* Many preliminary objections are raised by those among you and us, who are not prepared to go with us to the acceptance of this issue. They say

that they are tired of a hobby and of men of one idea; that the country is too great a country, and has too many interests to be occupied with one idea alone; besides that it is repulsive, offensive, disgusting to have "this eternal negro question" forever forced upon their consideration when they desire to think of white men and what belongs to them only. It is well, perhaps, to remove these preliminary objections before we go into an argument.

Granting for a moment that there is wisdom in the objection to this eternal negro question, pray, let us ask, who raised, who has kept up this eternal negro question?

The negro question was put at rest in 1787 by the fathers of the republic, and it slept, leaving only for moralists and humanitarians the question of emancipation, a question within the states, and by no means a federal question. Who lifted it up from the states into the area of federal politics? Who but the slaveholders, in 1820? They demanded that not only Missouri should be admitted as a slave state, located within the Louisiana purchase, but that slavery should be declared forever, and even that, without declaration of law, it was forever established and should prevail until the end of time, in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and in every foot of the then newly acquired domain of the United States? It was the slaveholding power which raised the negro question, and it was the democratic party which made an alliance with that power, and which, in the north and in congress, raised this very offensive legislation about negroes, instead of legislation about white men.

The question was put at rest by the compromise of 1820, when, God be praised, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska were saved for freedom, and only Arkansas and Missouri, out of the Louisiana purchase, surrendered to slavery. It slept again for fifteen or twenty years, and then the negro question was again introduced into the councils of the federal government—and by whom? By the slave power, when it said that "since you have taken Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska, and left us only Missouri, Arkansas and Florida, out of our newly acquired possessions, you must now go on and annex Texas, so that we shall have a balance and counterpoise in this government." Then the democratic party again were seized with a sudden desire to extend the area of slavery along the gulf of Mexico, and by way of balancing the triumph of liberty they even went so far as to hang manacles and chains on the claws of the conquering eagle of the country!

Who, then, is responsible for the eternal negro question? Still such was the forbearance, the patience, the hope without reason and without justice, of the friends of freedom throughout the United States, that the eternal negro question would have been left at rest then, if it had not again been brought into the federal councils in the years 1848 and 1850, when the slave power forced us into a war with Mexico, by which we acquired Upper California and New Mexico, and for no other purpose but that, notwithstanding all the advantages which slavery had gained since the Atlantic states were free, now, as a balance, slavery must have the Pacific coast.

Thus, on these three different occasions, when the public mind was at rest on the subject of the negro, the slave power forced it upon public consideration and demanded aggressive action. When they had at last secured the consent of the people of the free states to a compromise in 1850, by which it was agreed that California alone might be free, and that New Mexico should be remanded back into a territorial condition because she had not established slavery—then there was but one man in the United States Senate that would vote to accept New Mexico as a free state when she came with her constitution in her hands, and that man the humble individual who stands before you. Aye, you applaud me for it now, but where were your votes in 1850? Ah! well, that is past.

When they had agreed on a compromise, and had driven out of the senate every man but some half dozen representatives who had opposed the aggressions of slavery, were they content to let the negro question rest? No, in 1854 the democracy raised the negro question to force slavery finally and forever throughout the whole republic, by abrogating the Missouri compromise. They abandoned the territories of Kansas and Nebraska to slave labor, and actually assisted and encouraged the armies sent there by the slaveholders, to take forcible possession of regions which, until then, had been free.

O! what pleasure shall I have, in telling the people of Kansas, three days hence, how that when all others were faithless, and false, and timid, they renewed this battle of liberty, and expelled the intruding slaveholder, and established forever amongst themselves the freedom of labor and the freedom of men on the plains of Kansas.

Were the democracy then content? Not at all. They determined in 1858, to raise the negro question once more and to admit

Kansas into the Union, if she would come in as a slave state, and to keep her out indefinitely if she should elect freedom. And only one year later, when they found that Kansas was slipping from their clutches, who then raised once more the eternal negro question? The slave power and the administration took it up by demanding the annexation of Cuba, a slaveholding island of Spain, to be acquired at a cost of one hundred and fifty million dollars, peaceably, if it could be obtained for that sum, and forcibly if it should not be surrendered, for the purpose of adding two slave states, well manned and well appointed, to balance the votes of Kansas and Minnesota, then expected to come into the Union as free states.

Who has brought this issue and entered it on the record of this canvass? The slaveholding party—the democratic party. They held their convention first in this campaign at Charleston. They presented again the everlasting negro question, nothing more, nothing less. They differed about the form, but they gave us, nevertheless, the everlasting negro question in two different parts, giving us our choice to take one or the other, as they gave the people of Kansas the choice, whether they would take slavery pure and simple, or take it anyhow and get rid of it afterward if they could. Of one part, Mr. Breckinridge is the representative. It is presented plainly and distinctly; it is that slaves are merchandise and property in the territories under the constitution of the United States, and that the national legislatures and the courts must protect it in the territories, and no power on earth can discharge them of the responsibility Of the other, Mr. Douglas is the representative, and the form in which it is presented by those who support him is: What is the best way *not* to keep slavery out of the territories?

I doubt very much whether slaveholders have so great a repugnance to the negro and to the eternal negro question as they affect. On the other hand, being accustomed to sit in the federal councils, with grave and reverend senators, and to mingle with representatives of the people from slaveholding states, I find a great difference between myself and them on the subject. God knows, I should find it hard to consent to be the unbidden, the unchosen representative of bondmen! They must be freemen that I volunteer to represent; every man of them must be a whole man. But my respected friends who represent the slave states are willing, and do most cheerfully, most gladly consent to represent three-fifths of all

the negro slaves. They take a slave at three-fifths of a man, and they represent the three-fifths; I doubt not they would be very glad if he could be converted into five-fifths.

Well I think the democratic party has not so much repugnance to negroes and the negro question, because they consent to take offices of president, vice-president, secretary of state, ministers to Bogota, and to all other parts of the world, consulships and post offices, that are derived indirectly by adding another link to the chain of states in which negroes count, each one, three-fifths. No, no; slaveholders and the democratic party would be very glad to take votes from negroes, free or slave, by the head, at full count, if negroes and slaves would only vote for slavery; and it is only because they have a sagacious insight into human nature, which teaches them that negroes and slaves would vote for liberty, that makes the negro question so repulsive to them.

But is this one idea, the eternal negro question, so objectionable merely on account of the negro? I think not; I think it far otherwise; for after all, you see that the negro has less than anybody else in the world, to do with it. The negro is no party to it; he is only an incident; he is a subject of disputes but not one of the litigants. He has just as much to do with it as a horse or a watch in a justice's court, when two neighbors are litigating about its ownership. The controversy is not with the negro at all, but with two classes of white men, one who have a monopoly of negroes, and the other who have no negroes. One is an aristocratic class, that wants to extend itself over the new territories and so retain the power it already exercises; and the other is yourselves, my good friends, men who have no negroes and won't have any, and who mean that the aristocratic system shall not be extended. There is no negro question about it at all. It is an eternal question between classes—between the few privileged and the many unprivileged—the eternal question between aristocracy and democracy.

A sorrowful world this will be when that question shall be put to rest; for when it is, the rest that it shall have, shall be the same it has always had for six thousand years; the riding of the privileged over the necks of the unprivileged, booted and spurred. And the nation that is willing to establish such an aristocracy, and is shamed out of the defense of its own rights, deserves no better fate than that which befalls the timid, the cowardly and the unworthy.

It is to-day in the United States the same question that is filling Hungary, and is lifting the throne of a Cæsar of Austria from its pedestals; the same which has expelled the tyrant of Naples from the beautiful Sicily, and has driven him from his palace at Castellamare to seek shelter in his fortress at Gaeta. It is not only an eternal question, but it is a universal question. Every man from a foreign land will find here in America, in another form, the *irrepressible conflict* which crushed him out, an exile from his native land.

Again, I am not quite convinced that it is sound philosophy in anything, at least in politics, to banish the principle of giving paramount importance at any one time to one idea. If a man wishes to secure a good crop of wheat to pay off the debt he owes upon his land, he is seized with one idea in the spring, he plows, plants and sows, he gathers and reaps, with a single idea of getting forty bushels to the acre, if he can. If a merchant wishes to be successful, he surrenders himself to the one idea of buying as cheap and selling as dear as he honestly can. I would not give much for a lawyer who is put in charge of my case, that would suffer himself, when before the jury, to be distracted with a great many irrelevant ideas. I want one devoted to my cause. In the church we have a great many clergymen who have a horror of this one idea involved in the negro question, but I think it was St. Peter who had it made known to him, in a vision on the housetop, that he must not have scattered ideas; but on the contrary adopt one idea only, that of being satisfied with everything else, provided he could only win souls to his Master. And Paul was very much after this spirit; he said he would be all things to all men, provided he could save some souls. There was in the revolution one man seized with a terrible fanaticism, propelled by one idea He scattered terror all through this continent; and when he passed from Boston to the first congress in Philadelphia, deputations from New York and Philadelphia went out to meet and dissuade this erratic man of that one idea, namely, that of national independence. And still John Adams proved, after all, to be a public benefactor. There was, during the revolution, another man of one idea, that appeared to burn in him so ardently that he was regarded as the most dangerous man on the continent, and a triple reward was offered for his head. He actually went so far as to take all the men of one idea in the country, and suffer himself to take command of them in a rebellion. That man was George Washington.

His idea was justice, political justice. There was another monomaniac of the same kind down in Virginia; he, at the close of the revolution, had one idea, an eternal idea, and it even included negroes; and that was the idea of equality. This was Thomas Jefferson. Now, though the state which reared him might be glad if it could erase from his monument at Monticello its sublime inscription, yet the world can never lose that proud and beautiful epitaph, written by himself: "Here lies Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence." About the year 1805 or 1806, the French secretary for foreign affairs gave a dinner to the American representative at court, and to American citizens resident there, and there was a large and various party. When the wine flowed freely, and conversation ought to have been general, there was one young man who was possessed with one idea, and he could not keep quiet, but kept continually putting this idea before the minister and his guests, saying, "If you will only make up for me a purse, or show me a bank that will lend me five thousand dollars, I will put a boat on the Hudson river which will make the passage from New York to Albany at four miles an hour, without being driven by oars or sails." He was an offensive monomaniac, that Robert Fulton. But still, had it not been for his one idea, Iowa would have slept the last forty years, and down to the twentieth century, and not one human being before me, or within the boundaries of this state, would have resided here. What I understand by one idea is this: It simply means that a man, or a people, or a state, is in earnest. They get an idea which they think is useful, and they are in earnest. God save us when we are to abandon confidence in earnest men, and take to following trivial men of light minds, confused and scattered ideas, and weak purposes.

There is no such thing as government carried out without the intervention, the exaltation of one idea, and without the activity, guidance and influence of earnest men. You may be listless, indifferent, indolent, each one of you; do you therefore get other people to go to sleep? No. You may go to sleep, but you will find somebody, that has got one idea that you don't like, will be wide awake. Democrats are wide awake on the negro question as long as it pays, and it pays just as long as you will be content to follow their advice and take several ideas. Industry is the result of one idea. I have never heard of idle ones in the beaver's camp, but I do know there are drones in the beehive. Nevertheless, the

beaver's camp and the beehive alike give evidence of the domination of one idea. The Almighty Power himself could never have made the world, and never govern it, if he had not bent the force and application of the one idea to make it perfect. And when at seven o'clock in the morning, three months ago, with the almanac in my hand, I stood with my smoked glass between my eye and the sun to see whether the almanac maker was correct or whether nature vacillated between one idea and another, I was astonished to see that, at the very second of time indicated by the astronomer, the shadow of the moon entered the disk of the sun. There was one idea only in the mind of the Omnipotent Creator, that six thousand, or ten thousand, or twenty thousand, or hundreds of thousands of years ago, set that sun, that moon and this earth in their places, and subjected them to laws which brought that shadow exactly at this point at that instant of time. Earth is serious; heaven is serious; earth is earnest; heaven is earnest. There is no place for men of scattered and confused ideas in the earth below, or in the heavens above, whatever there may be in places under the earth. Every one idea has its negative. It has its destinies, its purpose, and it has its negative. So it is with the idea of slavery. It means nothing less, nothing more, nothing different from the extension of commerce or trading in slaves; and in our national system it means the extension of commerce in slaves into regions where that commerce has no right to exist. The negative of that is our principle which we are endeavoring to inculcate upon you, namely: opposition to trading in slaves within those portions of the territory where slaves are not lawfully a subject of merchandise.

At the time of the compromise of 1820, the democratic party saw, for they are wise men, and their opponents, Rufus King, John W. Taylor and others in congress, saw, that there was an irrepressible conflict between the two ideas of slavery and freedom, or rather between the two sides of one idea. The alternative offered to the democracy and to all the people of the United States, was a plain one; the slaveholders are strong, are united; there are many slave states, and they are agreed in their policy; there are as many free states, but they are divided in opinion. Lend your support to the slave states, and you shall have the power, patronage, honors and glory of administering the government of the United States. Some asked, for how long? Wise men cast the horoscope and said forty

years; just about that time an infant state shall grow up north of Missouri within the Louisiana purchase, and another shall grow up in Kansas. The great men I have named seemed few and feeble in numbers; still they would rather have quiet consciences during all the time, and postpone honors and rewards for forty years, rather than to take the side of slavery; and the democratic party reasoning otherwise, said, "Give us the offices and power now; we will hold it the forty years, and more if we can." They say that the "old one" is inexorable; that when he makes a bond he lives up to it, but when the time is up he calls for his own. To Mr. Breckinridge, Mr. Douglas, slave states and all, he says: "I have given you all the indulgence that was allowed me to give you, now you must go."

This, my young friends, for I see many such around me, brings me to a point where I can give you one instruction which, if you practice as long as you live, may make at least some of you great men, honorable men, useful men. Remember that all questions have two sides; one is the right side, and the other the wrong side; one is the side of justice, the other that of injustice; one the side of human nature, the other of crime. If you take the right side, the just side, ultimately men, however much they may oppose you and revile you, will come to your support; earth with all its powers will work with you and for you, and Heaven is pledged to conduct you to complete success. If you take the other side, there is no power in earth or Heaven that can lead you through successfully, because it is appointed in the councils of Heaven that justice, truth and reason alone can prevail. This instruction would be incomplete if I were not to add one other, that indifference between right and wrong is nothing else than taking the wrong side. The policy of a great leader of the democratic party in the north is indifference; it is nothing to him whether slavery is voted up or voted down in the territories. Thus it makes no difference to that distinguished statesman whether slavery is voted up or voted down in the new states; whether they all become slave states or free states. Let us see how this would have worked in the revolution. If Jefferson had been indifferent as to whether congress voted up the declaration of independence or voted it down, what kind of a time would he have had with it. Patrick Henry would have been after him with a vigilant committee, and he would now have no monument over his remains.

The British government would have liked nothing better than a lot of such indifferent men for leaders of the American people, and George the Third and his dynasty might have had rule over this continent for a thousand years to come.

I have thus removed the preliminary objection always interposed on these occasions against the indulgence of the eternal negro question. What is the just and right national policy with regard to slavery in the territories and in the new states of the Federal Union? Your decision of that subject will involve the consideration of what you consider to be the natural constituents of a state. I suppose I may infer from your choosing this beautiful land on the western bank of the Mississippi, that you all want to make Iowa a great and good state, a flourishing and prosperous state. You consider the development of the latent resources with which nature has supplied the region on which you build a state, as one of the material things to be considered in building up a great state; that is to say, you will have the forests subjugated and make them contribute the timber and lumber for the house, for the city, for the wharf, for the steamer, for the ship of war, and for all the purposes of civilized society. Then I think if the land has concealed within it deposits of iron, or lead, or coal, you will think of getting these out as rapidly as you can, so as to increase the public wealth. Then I think that you will have the same idea about states everywhere else that you have about Iowa; and that your first idea about the way to make a state corresponds with my idea how to make a great nation. And as you would subdue the forests, would develop the lead, iron and coal in your region; as you would improve the fields, putting ten oxen to a plow to turn up the prairie, and then plant it with wheat and corn; as you would encourage manufactures, and try, by making railways and telegraphs, to facilitate interchange of products; so this is exactly what I propose to do for every new state like Iowa that is to be admitted into the Federal Union. To be sure we shall leave the slave states, which are all in the Union, as they are; our responsibilities are limited to the states which are yet to come into the Union, and we will apply our system to them. The first point, then, in making a state, is to favor the industry of the people, and industry is favored in every land exactly as it is free and uncrippled.

We are a great nation; we have illimitable forests in the far east and on the banks of the upper waters of the Mississippi, around the lakes and on the Pacific coast. No human arithmetic could compute the amount of materials of the forest that have already gone into the aggregate of the wealth which this nation possesses. At this day there is hardly one foot of timber, or one foot of dealboards, or a lath, or a shingle, entering into the commerce of the United States that is fabricated by a slave. You all have an idea, or had in the land from which you came here, of the value and importance of the fisheries, of making the ocean surrender its treasures to increase the national wealth. The fisherman is seen in the winter time fishing for ice in the ponds and lakes of Massachusetts; and if you go to Palestine, or to Grand Cairo, or to the furthest Indies, you will find yourself regaled with ice fished out of the lakes and ponds of Massachusetts. Ice is not a product that goes far to the support of human life; but can you tell me in what part of the earth men are not lighted on their way by night, or in their dwellings, by the produce of the fisheries? Have you any idea how much the great machinery of the country engaged in fabrication of goods and in navigation is indebted to the fisheries? Those of the United States are a great source of national wealth; and a nursery of seamen for the commercial marine and naval service of the United States, indispensable for the development of the resources of a great people. I might almost say that there is not now, and there never was, on lake or river, sea or bay, over the whole world, from the Arctic to the Antarctic pole, a negro slave fisherman. You have been very indifferent about these subjects.

It was only two years ago, only by constant watchfulness and activity of the friendly representatives of the free states in congress, that the protection of the United States was saved for the fisheries. The slaveholders don't want ice to be gathered with free-soil hands; they would rather have it taken from the lakes and rivers of Russia. They don't want the fisheries conducted by free hands at home; they would rather take their supplies from foreign markets. The fisheries are somewhat foreign for you, but the quarries are not—the granite and the marble out of which our capitol is being constructed, our great cities erected, some of them are in your own beautiful city. Have you any idea of how large a portion of the national wealth is extracted from the quarries of granite and marble and freestone? It

is beyond my capacity to compute. Yet there is not a slave engaged in a quarry in the United States. Have you any slaves down your shafts in your lead mines here? Not one. Have you any slaves in your coal mines? Not one. Any in your iron mines? Not one. Pennsylvania is being burrowed all through and through in all directions, and the iron and coal taken out and fabricated. There is not a single slave, nor was there ever one, that raised his hand to add to that supply of national wealth. On the other hand, you have in Maryland and in Virginia deposits of coal and iron as rich, aye, and of gold, too; and yet in Maryland and Virginia, slave states as they are, in their iron, coal and silver mines, the work is mainly done by freemen. I need not speak of manufactures; the African slave is reduced to a brute, as nearly as may be, and he is incompetent to cast a shuttle, to grease or oil a wheel and keep it in motion. In all the vast manufacturing establishments in the United States; in all the establishments of the forest, and of the fisheries, or of manufactures throughout the whole world, there is not one African slave to be found. California rejected the labor of slaves, and well she did so; for if she had invited and courted it, her mines, instead of yielding fifty millions of gold per year to the commerce of the United States, would be yielding nothing. Could a man subsist in Iowa by cultivating wheat or corn by slave labor?

Commerce is of two kinds, domestic and foreign. The commerce down the Mississippi and up, the commerce on railroads, is domestic commerce; the commerce across the ocean with foreign nations, is foreign commerce. In New Orleans I found that sixteen thousand men were engaged in domestic trading on the river between New Orleans and the up country in the Mississippi valley. How many of them were slaves? Not one. Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, New York, Michigan, send the boatmen who conduct the commerce even in slave states, while on all the oceans there is not a slave engaged in commerce.

Now the three great wheels of national wealth are agriculture, including the subjugation of the forests, manufactures and trade. Slaves are unfit, African slaves are absolutely unfit to be employed in turning either of those wheels; and it thus enters into the elements of a great and prosperous state that its people shall not be slaves but freemen. The reason is obvious; it is the interest of the freeman to improve himself as well as he can, to produce the most

he can, at the least cost; and it is the interest of the slave to be as disqualified as he can, to consume as much as he can, and produce as little more than he consumes as possible.

It is not wealth alone that makes a nation. It must have strength and power to command, by the mere signification of its will, peace and good order at home and respect and confidence abroad. Just imagine the United States converted into planting states in which the labor was performed only by negro slaves, and judge, if you can, what would be the police power of the government in any of the states. The laborer in a slave state is watched night and morning; his outgoings, his incomings, his path is surrounded by a police; he can pass to execute the order of his master only on a permit or license. He must retire to sleep at nine or ten at night, and must not be abroad from the plantation without a special license, for no other reason than that his master regards him as an enemy to be watched. Turn a whole nation into masters watching slaves, and slaves regarded as natural enemies—what is the power of that nation to preserve peace at home? What its power to command respect abroad? Make us for once a nation of slave states, and any feeble, contemptible power in Europe has only to instigate insurrection among our slaves, then instead of relying on ourselves we should want to make a federal union with Canada, that we might get protection, just as the free states now protect the slave states.

But these elements—material wealth and power—are but part of what constitute a nation. It should have a head, an enlightened head; an open, free, manly, honest heart. Such a head and heart as will enable any man or woman to go through the world with safety. A nation is only an aggregate of individuals, of so many heads to work as one head; of so many hearts to beat as one heart. You want an enlightened free people to constitute a nation; and if you have such a people, they are perpetually reducing the sacrifice, and toil of muscle; and if it be true as theologians say, that labor is the primal curse imposed by the Maker on man for disobedience, then this benevolent heart and enlightened head will suggest all manner of machines to relieve them of the necessity of physical labor. The poor widow, who, to eke out a subsistence, has to sew for her neighbors, will, with a machine that costs but from fifty to one hundred dollars—the invention of a freeman—make fifty garments where before she made but one. And the steam engine—it plows, plants,

sows and harvests; it threshes; it gathers into the granaries; it hauls the cars loaded with produce; it drives the steamboat on the river. That is what invention does. Now out of the million inventions which the American people enjoy, there is not one that was made by a slave, and simply because the slave is imbruted in his heart and stupified in his intellect.

A nation to be great wants character—character for justice, honesty, integrity; for ability to maintain its own rights and respect for the rights of others. That it cannot have, if it be a nation of slaves. It is only a nation of freemen that can cultivate the virtues which constitute a character. These virtues are two; justice, equal and exact justice among men; the equal freedom and liberty of every other man. The other virtue is courage. The freeman has no enemies; he is just; he oppresses nobody; nobody wishes to be revenged upon him. A nation of freemen are safe; they provoke nobody; they wrong nobody; they covet nothing; they keep the tenth commandment. And nations must keep the commandments as well as individuals, or suffer the same penalty. But you cannot have these morals except on one condition, and that is that the people of the nation are trained up in them. And how trained? By schools and general instruction, free press, free debate at home, and in legislative councils; and everywhere to be undisturbed as they go in and come out. Introduce slavery in Iowa, and what kind of freedom of speech would you enjoy? What kind of freedom of the press? freedom of bridges? of taverns? Just look across the state of Missouri into Kansas, and you will find freedom of the press, provided you will maintain that property is above labor, that slavery is before all constitutions and governments—you will find that kind of freedom of speech which sought the expulsion of John Quincy Adams from the congress of the United States, for presenting a petition in favor of human rights; that kind of freedom of debate which arrested my distinguished and esteemed friend, Charles Sumner, in the midst of a glorious and useful career, and doomed him to wander a sufferer and invalid for four years. As for freedom of bridges, why the bridge over the Missouri at Kansas was proved to be only a bridge for slave state men; and the tavern at Lawrence was subverted for a nuisance on account of its being a tavern at which free state men could rest.

It is a bright September afternoon, and a strange feeling of surprise comes over me that I should be here in the state of Iowa—the state

redeemed and saved in the compromise of 1820—a state peopled by freemen—that I should be here in such a state, before such a people, imploring its citizens to maintain the cause of freedom instead of the cause of slavery. It is a great change from the position I was in only a year ago. In Italy, in Austria, in Turkey even, I was excusing, in the best way I could, the monstrous delinquencies of the American people in tolerating slavery, which even the Turk had abrogated. You tell me that it is unnecessary; that you are all right; I happen to know better. No! the wide-awakes are not up an hour too soon; they do not sit up any too late o' nights; their zeal is not a bit too strong to save the state of Iowa from giving her votes, in the present canvass, in favor of the policy which has for forty years made slavery the cardinal institution, and freedom secondary to it in the United States. There is something of excuse and apology for this; it is in the reluctance which men who are always opposed to one new idea coming in, have to give up the old idea, which they have so long cherished. The democratic party has a wonderful affection for the name; the *prestige* of the democratic party; and most of them must die unconverted. It is not in human nature that adult men and women change their opinions with facility; it is little ones like these before me that receive reforms unobserved and unknown. Ten thousand of their votes enter into every successive canvass in the state of Iowa. In every state the great reformation which has been made within the last six years—for we date no further back than that—has been the dying out of the one-idea men of democracy and the growing up of the young one-idea men of republicanism. And now why shall we not insist, so far as our votes shall be effective, that the territories shall remain free territories, so that new states which shall hereafter be added to this Union shall be free states?

They say we interfere in the slave states. Not at all. We do not vote against slavery in Virginia. We do not authorize Abraham Lincoln or the congress of the United States to pass any laws about slavery in Virginia. We merely authorize them to intervene in the territories, and to pass laws securing freedom there. They tell us that it is unnecessary. They have rendered it necessary, because they have explained the laws and the constitution to establish slavery there, and we must either restrict slavery there or reverse the decision made by the federal tribunal. But they tell us that this is incon-

venient; it excites violence in the slave states. To which I answer that they have the choice between slavery and freedom as well as we; but they must be content to leave it where it is. When they choose to carry slaves into the territories we interfere. What we are attacking is not slavery in the United States, but slavery in the territories. But they tell us that we are incurring very great harm; that our southern friends, driven angry, will not buy of us. Mayor Wood made the discovery that we are a trading people, and we shall lose our trade if the republican party come into power. We are a trading people as we are an eating people, a drinking people, a clothes-wearing people. Trade! trade! trade! the great character, the great employment, the one idea of the American people! It is a libel. We buy only with what we produce. We buy and sell, but that is merely incidental to our greater occupation of producing and making; and even these are subordinate to our great notion of educating and cultivating ourselves to make a great, virtuous and happy people. Trade, however, for those who engage in it, knows no respect of opinion; the southern planters will buy their cotton bagging of the men who will make it the cheapest, and they will insist on selling cotton to the Castle Garden committees and the Cooper Institute patriots at precisely the same price as they will to Wendell Phillips and Frederick Douglass. They won't buy your wheat unless hungry for bread; and if hungry for bread they will gladly give you for it any surplus of cotton you want.

I have refrained from adverting to the higher sentiments of humanity which enter into the consideration of this subject, because those are considerations that are always with you. I will now, however, say that the suggestions of justice are always in harmony with the suggestions and impulses of humanity, and that both spring from the same source. Nature herself seems to be forbearing; she seems to be passive and silent. She lets nations as she lets individuals go on in their course of action, violating her laws; but this is for a season only. The time comes at last when nature unerringly vindicates every right, and punishes every wrong, in the actions of men or states. She comes, then, in terror, in revolution, in anarchy, in chaos. You will let this government and this nation slide down still further the smooth declivity of national vice if you choose: nature will bring it back again in due time with convulsions which will wake the sighs and groans of the civilized world.

YOUNG MEN AND THE FUTURE.[1]

THE past, since the adoption of the constitution, has been occupied with trials to compromise the conflict between property in man and the freedom of man, and these trials have proved unsuccessful. The future demands the settlement of it now, by a return to the principles of the declaration of independence and the constitution. This conclusion can be reached only by accepting the principle of the political equality of men within the exclusive range of the federal constitution. This is simply a matter of education. It is not worth while to spend much time upon this subject in trying to convert old men; they cannot last long, and therefore can do little harm. We all become settled in our opinions and confirmed in our habits as we grow old. The republican party is a party chiefly of young men. Each successive year brings into its ranks an increasing proportion of the young men of this country.

This is the ground of my hope, of my confidence, that before this generation shall have passed away, the democratic party will cease to exist; and the republican party, or at least its principles, will be accepted and universally prevail. If it be true, as the declaration of independence asserts, that the right of all men to political equality is self-evident, nothing can prevent the acknowledgment of that fact by the generation now rising, since that truth is distinctly inculcated now, for the first time, through all the agencies of private and public education. The young man who shall reject it will find himself in controversy with the ever-growing sentiment of his countrymen, and the settled public opinion of the world. Let him take heed how he enters upon a course which can bring nothing but unavailing contention, disappointment and regret over the failure of his ambition and of his desire for usefulness. Train up your children in the belief of this great principle of our constitution, and they will secure for themselves the satisfaction of leading useful and honorable lives, and follow you to your graves with more than even filial veneration.

[1] Extract from a speech at Cleveland, Oct. 4, 1860.

KANSAS THE SAVIOR OF FREEDOM.

LAWRENCE, SEPTEMBER 26, 1860.

A LONG cherished desire of mine is fulfilled; at last a long deferred duty is about to be paid—the desire of my heart to see the people of Kansas—the duty that I felt I owed to the people of Kansas, to see them in their own homes and in their own houses. I have visited your chief cities, Leavenworth and Lawrence—where the army of mercenaries sent by the slave states battered down the hotel, under an indictment and conviction in a court of the United States as a nuisance, because it sheltered the freemen who had come here to see freedom established in Kansas. And I have looked also upon the Constitution Hall, in Topeka, where the army of the United States, for the first time in the history of our nation, dispersed a lawful and peaceable assembly of citizens of the United States, convened to counsel upon the best means of protecting their lives, their property and sacred honor. You, people of Kansas, whom I have not been able to see in your homes, have come up here to greet me, from the valleys of the Kansas, the Big Blue and the Neosho, and from all your plains and valleys.

I seem not to have journeyed hither, but to have floated across the sea,—the prairie sea,—under bright autumnal skies, wafted by genial breezes into the havens where I wished to be. I am not sorry that my visit has occurred at this particular time, so sad in its influence, when nature, that sends its rains upon the unjust as well as the just, has for a year withdrawn its genial showers from the soil of Kansas. It is well to see one's friends in darkness and sadness, as well as in the hour of joy. I have beheld the scenes of your former conflicts. I have also looked upon that beautiful eminence on the banks of the Kansas river, where Lecompton sits a lonely widow, desolate and mourning, her ambitious structures showing how high is the ambition of slavery, and their desolation showing how easy,

after all, is her downfall. I would have seen more of Kansas, if I had not been interrupted and impeded in my course through the state by the hospitality and kindness of the people, which I could not turn aside. I have been excessively retentive at Leavenworth and Topeka, refusing to open my lips, because I do not like to say things by piecemeal.

I desire to speak openly to you, in the broad daylight, in the hearing of the women as well as men of Kansas; and here, where I have renewed the memories of the contest waged upon this soil, while I see around me the broken implements with which that contest was waged by the aggressors under the plea of popular sovereignty, which left the people perfectly free to do just as they please, subject to the constitution of the United States, which they were left perfectly free to interpret as they pleased, while the authorities at Washington have never been able to interpret it.

When I look at field after field, and cabin after cabin, and church after church, and school house after school house, where but six years ago was the unbroken range of savages, I am prepared here—not expecting to escape being heard on the Pacific as well as the Atlantic coast—I am prepared to declare, and do declare you people of Kansas the most intelligent and the bravest and most virtuous people of the United States. That is the most intelligent and bravest and most virtuous people which can take the banner of human freedom when it is trailed in the dust by the government of its choice, and can and does raise it aloft and protect it and bear it to success and honor—and that without bloodshed and violence.

People of Kansas! you are at once the youngest, the newest people—the newest state, as well as the youngest of all the thirty-four American states; you are the poorest in wealth, the least favored with political power, for you are nearly disfranchised—and yet you are the most inflexible and the most constant. The two richest states in the Union are Massachusetts and New York, but they are so merely because they are the freest, the wisest and the most liberty-loving states of the Union. I apprehend that you scarcely understand, yourselves, the importance of the position which you hold in this republic. You will perhaps be surprised when I tell you that the secret of all the interest I have felt in you has been merely this: That you occupy a pivotal position in the republic of the United States, with regard to slavery and freedom. There is no contest, no

difference on this subject, along the line of the northeastern states, for they are hostile to slavery. There is no difference on the line of the southern states, for they are in favor of slavery. But there has been a severe strife between freedom and slavery, for the establishment of freedom or slavery in all the wide region reaching from the Missouri to the Pacific ocean. If freedom was to triumph in this contest, there was no point where she could expect to meet the enemy except on the very place she has met it—here. And if you had been false, slavery would have swept along through the Indian territory, Texas and the whole of the country including the Rocky mountains, to the Pacific ocean.

California was imperfectly secured to freedom, and with a compromise. You opened a new campaign here to reclaim what was given up in that already broken compromise, and it has been crowned with a complete victory. Henceforth the battle is ended; henceforth the emigrant from the eastern states, from Germany and Ireland, the free laborer, in short, from every land on the earth, when he reaches the Missouri river, will enter on a broad land of impartial liberty.

He can safely pursue his way under the banner of freedom to the foot of the Rocky mountains; and there the hosts of freemen from the western coast will unite and join under the same banner, extending north and south. Everywhere, except in Missouri, is a land of freedom. Missouri stands an island of slavery in the midst of a broad ocean of liberty. You occupy not only the pivotal position, but it was your fortune to attempt this great enterprise in behalf of freedom at a critical period for mankind. Slavery was then just two hundred years old in the United States. In the year 1776 our fathers gave battle to slavery; they declared war against it, and pledged their lives and sacred honor in the service against it. Practically, it was to be destroyed peaceably under the constitution of the United States. Those good men believed it would reach its end long before this period; but the people became demoralized. The war went back, *back*, BACK, until 1854—until all guaranties of freedom in every part of the United States were abandoned, and Kansas, that had for forty years been perfectly free from the footsteps of the slave, was pronounced by the highest power of the government as much a slave state as South Carolina. The flag of the United States was made the harbinger, not of freedom, but of human bondage.

It was at this crisis that the people of Kansas appeared on the stage, reviled and despised, and lifted the banner of liberty on high, and bore it manfully forward, defied all force, and yet counteracted peaceably all the efforts made to subdue them. In three years they not only secured freedom in Kansas, but in all the territory of the United States.

You have made Kansas as free as Massachusetts, and made the federal government, on and after the fourth of March next, the patron of freedom—what it was at the beginning. You have made freedom national, and slavery sectional. Had you receded after your first conditional or provisional government was dispersed at Topeka by cannon and bayonet; had you surrendered and accepted the Lecompton constitution; had you even abandoned the Wyandott constitution, at any stage of the battle, it would have destroyed the cause of freedom not only in Kansas, but also throughout the whole Union.

I know I shall be justified in history; shall I not be justified by cotemporaries? Wise, best, bravest of citizens, no other hundred thousand people in the United States have contributed as much for the cause of freedom as Kansas. Before this people, then, appearing for the first time, I bow myself, as I have never done before to any other people, in profound reverence. I salute you with gratitude and affection.

Fellow citizens, my time here, as well as yours, is brief. It is but few of many subjects upon which we can even touch. As to the least important subject of all, myself, I give you, in one word, my sincere and heartfelt thanks. I had formed my opinion of you from your past conduct and history. I have not been disappointed in your kindness. For all that remains to me, give yourselves no trouble. Freedom is saved and assured to California and Kansas, and therefore assured to the future states in the Rocky mountains. If I may, indeed, hope that my poor name will find a place in the history of California and Kansas, then all the ambition I have ever cherished is more than abundantly satisfied.

The second consideration to which I would advert for a moment, is this sadness which lies like a pall over a large part of the territory of Kansas—the result of the withdrawal of the rain for a period so long as to excite apprehensions of famine.

I have carefully examined the condition of Kansas—the river bottoms and the prairies, and my conclusion is—not more from the

condition of the crops than from the character of the people—that there will be no famine in Kansas, because there is wealth and credit enough in Kansas to carry you through more than one year like this. You will take care of this credit and retain it so far as possible. If this will not do, then appeal to your friends in the east, and they will not allow you to suffer. I myself will do what I can for you. Be of good cheer. Suffer yourselves not to be discouraged. There are cattle enough on your thousand hills, if sold—although it is a fearful sacrifice—to carry you through and sustain you during the winter, and still come out in the spring with milch cows and working oxen. And we who are here—coming from states whence emigration flows, and from the Atlantic states, where emigrants are received and sent onward—will all do our share to direct emigration to Kansas, assuring them from our own observation, that it is a climate as salubrious as any in the world, and a soil as rich as any the sun ever shone upon. This is a smiling and fair dominion, and we think, were we set back twenty or thirty years, the place of all others that we would seek for homes in the United States would be the plains of Kansas.

One other consideration. When we see before us the transactions of this day, do they not illustrate the subject of the "irrepressible conflict?" Did not our forefathers, in 1787, settle this whole question, and, by an ordinance, put at rest forever the question of freedom and slavery in the United States? Certainly they did. Did they not, in 1820, settle this conflict forever? Did they not declare that all north of 36° 30′ and west of the Missouri river should be given up to freedom? Certainly they did. Was it not settled finally a third time in 1850, when Kansas and Nebraska were still saved to freedom, and all lying west of them? Was it not settled a fourth time in 1854, when it was ordained that the people of Kansas were free to choose freedom or slavery for themselves, subject to the constitution of the United States? Was it not settled for the fifth time, when the Lecompton constitution was adopted by one scratch of the pen of the President of the United States and the Supreme Court—and this became a land of slavery? Why was not slavery *settled* by all these settlements? For no other reason than because the conflict was irrepressible. But you determined, in your struggle for Kansas, that she shall be forever free; and that settles the question. In New Mexico they tried to settle it in favor of slavery, but they now

find it is irrepressible there. I think you will find that the whole battle has been settled in the deliverance of Kansas, and that henceforth freedom will be triumphant in all the territories in the United States.

And yet, while this is clear to these intelligent, practical and sensible men who have gone through the problem, what a contrast is seen here to what is occurring in other parts of the United States, where they suppose, because they are older, they are so much wiser; where they believe me still as false a prophet as Mohammed. In Pennsylvania they have not yet made up their minds that there is any conflict at all, much less that it is irrepressible. In the southern states they are actually organizing a militia against the freemen who are establishing freedom in Kansas and New Mexico, as if the settlers in Kansas were no wiser than they are, and would seek to propagate freedom by the sword. When freemen want to make a territory free, they give it ballot boxes, and school houses and churches; and slavery will never triumph where these are first established.

But to go a little deeper into the subject. In 1776 and 1787, there were wise men administering the government of the United States; and if you look into their sayings, you will see they had all found out that this republic was to be the home of an ever-increasing people, so free, so proud, so wise, so vigorous, that they could not be confined in the old thirteen states; they saw that this republic was to be the home of free men, of free labor, and not slave labor. So, they set apart all the territory within their reach, *i. e.*, all they then had control over—for freedom and for free emigration. Now, contrast that which was wisely done in 1787 with what actually happened in 1820! In 1820 it was found that the population of the United States had crossed the Mississippi. Then what was necessary was, to provide exactly the same kind of government for the territory west of the Mississippi, as had been provided for the country east of it; so that, when the government should be extended to the Pacific, all should be free. Could anything have been wiser than for government in 1850 to have given freedom to these territories? But it did not. They had previously given Missouri to slavery, and said freedom might take the rest; but now they wished to block up free labor by the barrier of slave Missouri. Could anything have been more absurd than to thus attempt to stay the course of freemen? Either free labor must go out of the United States, or it

must go round Missouri to Kansas and New Mexico. It did go round for a short season, but then it broke their barriers, and passed through the very garrison of the slave power.

There were long ago good and brave men who foretold this result. There was John Quincy Adams, who remonstrated against the extension of slavery as political suicide. There were Henry W. Taylor, James Tallmadge, and peerless among them all, Rufus King, who declared in the senate of the United States, that the slave power in Missouri would prove a mockery; that this land was for liberty; and that the slave power would repent in sackcloth and ashes. But these good men were overruled. Missouri and Arkansas came into the Union with slavery. And for what reason? It was because the slaveholders had property—capital which must not be confiscated, even to prevent slavery from being established over as large a domain as half of Europe. This was the reason the federal government determined to secure their slaves to the capitalists of Missouri. What capital had Missouri in slaves that was saved at that time? All the slaves in Missouri at that time, were exactly ten thousand two hundred and twenty in number, and were worth (I was born a slaveholder, and know something of the value of slaves) three hundred dollars a head, including the old and young, the sick and decrepid, which made the total value of the slaves in Missouri, in 1820, three million sixty-six thousand dollars. Arkansas then had one thousand six hundred slaves, worth four hundred and eighty thousand dollars. The whole capital of slaves in Missouri and Arkansas was about three million five hundred thousand dollars, but to save that capital in negroes, the great compromise of 1820 was made, and those states given up to slavery. Three million and a half of dollars was a large sum, but nobody then or ever proposed to confiscate it. They were left free to sell their slaves; they were at liberty to keep them, so only that they should import no more. There was no need of confiscating the slaves in Missouri any more than there was in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; so this three million five hundred thousand dollars was never in jeopardy.

Even if it had been confiscated, how small a sacrifice of property it was, weighed against the incalculable blessing of freedom over the American continent. Look now at the advantages of their success, and see how unavailing are the contrivances of politicians, and even

of nations, to counteract and control the great moving principle of the age. We all see plainly enough now that it was preposterous to expect that merely by making Missouri a slave state in 1820, it would follow, forty years afterwards, when the canals of New York and Pennsylvania were burdened with commerce, when steamers dotted all our inland lakes and rivers, when teachers and preachers were abroad through the land, a slave state could be made out of Kansas? They tried it, and what have they got? They have got slavery in Missouri and Arkansas; freedom in Kansas, and practically in New Mexico, in Utah and California. That is what comes from attempting to bind up the decrees of Providence in flaxen bands by human skill. Why did their attempt fail? It failed because society has its rights and its necessities. It was just as necessary that men should move out of Massachusetts and New York and the western states, and Missouri even, into the territories, as it is necessary that Kansas and other territories should receive them when they have come. It was just as necessary that the exile of Europe should have a place where he was perfectly free to have no slaves. The movement of the age is quickened by the agency of mind and of inventions; all the operations of trade, the arts and manufactures, are accelerated by mechanical skill. Who thinks now of drawing himself to town with a pair of mules? The steam engine carries him there with less cost than he could walk or go on wagons. All the implements with which work and husbandry are done, are the product of mechanical skill. Every farmer sees that by the improvements made in the implements for cultivating the soil, every year he is able to dispense with the services of one more laborer, who becomes himself an independent farmer.

Europe has been in a state of commotion for more than sixty years, and still is. Ireland was bound to seek relief; Germany was over populated, and must have an outlet for her energy and labor. What madness and folly, then, that the statesmen of 1820 should open this country to slavery, and instead of securing it teeming with wealth and abundant cultivation, should abandon it to the production of negroes at fifteen hundred dollars a head! It is because I speak so plainly of these things that some believe me not a very conservative man. I think you are wiser than your fathers, wherever you may have come from. I had a father who was a very wise man, but I think I should be unworthy of him, had I not sought to improve my better

opportunities to become a wiser man than he. It would have been much better for Missouri and Arkansas could they have foreseen the consequence of their action. The consequence of their embracing slavery is that the tide of emigration in 1820, which would naturally have come up the Mississippi river, was driven round into other regions. Instead of entering at New Orleans, it sought the ports of New York and Quebec, peopled the provinces of Canada and the line of the northern lakes. There are three millions of settlers in the provinces which slavery in Missouri sent round there. This same tide of emigration peopled Northern Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan, and thence passed west to Iowa, Nebraska and Kansas. Missouri has thus lost from her soil all this population. At last the mass of emigration got to be so dense that it could not divide and spread itself, so making a great rush, it swept through Missouri, through the very strongholds of slavery. There is not within the longitude of my voice probably one man, if Missouri had been wise, and had not driven emigration from its natural course, that would ever have set foot on the soil of Kansas. There is population enough in Kansas now to make Missouri a great state.

But Missouri does not want to be a great state. She prefers to wait and be a slave state. She has no affection for the people of the north, but a great affection for the people of the south. She has no affection for free labor, but a great affection for slave labor. She has no free speech; she is satisfied to have what she may say, or may not, controlled by the slave power. This is a sad case for Missouri, but not hopeless. She must look for deliverance to Kansas, which Missouri at first overrun and subjugated, and which Missouri refused to let come into the Union, but which is drawing emigration through Missouri, and opening the way, and marking out the very course, and inviting Missouri on, and calling upon eastern capitalists to open a national highway to Pike's Peak and California. Missouri to-day is richer by millions on millions by the settlement of Kansas by free men. All her hopes of competition with the free northern states are based upon what you are doing, and can do, and will do, to make a Pacific railroad through to the Pacific ocean. Never was policy of any state more suicidal; for either she is to be forever a slave state, as she desires to be, or she had better have been free from the beginning. If she is a slave state, she must be a planting state merely, and the value of her land would be nearly worthless—for,

on an average, the value of land in a free state is exactly threefold the value of land in a slave state. Then, if Missouri wants to be a slave state, the wisest thing she can do is to do on the west what she has done on the east, namely, consent to be surrounded with free, prosperous states.

These free states which you are building in Kansas and Nebraska are showing and opening the true national highway to the Pacific ocean. You are producing around Missouri the influences which they dread and call abolitionizing. I don't know any way in which such an operation can be done with so much quietness as to go round her, and leave her to abolitionize herself. She will do it, too, because Missouri has got capital, and she will find out that if she is a slave state and Kansas free, Kansas, in twenty years, will send more members to congress than Missouri—and people, though slaveholders, don't like to give up political power.

Another lesson which this occasion teaches us, is instructive in an eminent degree. When Missouri, in 1820, compelled congress to admit her as a slave state, and in 1854 to abrogate the Missouri compromise, and in 1856 drove all freemen from Kansas, in order to have slavery in Kansas, she did not see how futile would be her efforts. Missouri obtained these concessions for slavery from the general government, not because the people of the United States love slavery, but because they love the Union. But all the efforts of the slave power were defeated by bands of emigrants from New England, from New York and other eastern states, from Germany and Ireland—who came up the Missouri river, fearless of cannons, and found the slaveholders here armed; and they drove them out of the territory, and established what is called an "Abolition" territory—making it a place for connection by the "Underground Railroad" with every state. Who would have believed that this could have been done, and that we should have met here to-day to celebrate it with all kinds of demonstrations—by the firing of cannon, by dinners and balls—and the Union be just as safe now as it was before?

Another consideration. It is not our choice, fellow citizens, that our lot as a people is cast upon a continent, and that we are so constituted that in spite of ourselves we must become, sooner or later, the possessors of the whole continent of North America, from Hudson's bay to the gulf of Mexico, from the Pacific to the Atlantic

coast. France and Spain and Great Britain, who formerly occupied vast possessions on this continent, have been gradually giving way, retiring. Every year they are weaker, and it is only a question of fifty or one hundred years, before we shall be masters of the American confederacy or republic, over all this.

Now, a government which is to be extended over a continent needs wealth; it needs riches. A great government needs wealth in proportion to its extent; its people must have wealth as an element of their happiness and prosperity. It is utterly contemptible and ridiculous to say, that the continent of North America, instead of being peopled by free men, who are willing to take it at forty acres apiece and enrich it,—instead of this, to turn off all these free laborers, and get slaves from Africa at two hundred dollars a head. What wealth have they in the slave states? I much mistake if the people of Kansas would, ten years hence, exchange their wealth for that of the Old Dominion—slaves included.

Great nations require something more than wealth; they need intelligence, vigor and energy among the people. You are to-day planted here, where, if, as they apprehend, the slaves become discontented, and the people of the slave states are to be protected, you are the very men upon whom they must rely for that protection; you are the men to defend them; you must also raise the means to defend the national flag upon every sea, and over all this continent. Give men freedom; then every freeman will give you a return—an equivalent for it; deny them that, and every man becomes an alien, an enemy, under the government. You remember how feeble and defenseless we free state men were ten years ago; you see now that we are established upon the Pacific ocean and in Kansas in the centre of the continent, and we might almost say that—

"We are monarchs of all we survey."

This success, this power, has been obtained—how? It has been obtained amid reproach, invective, against force, fraud, and the power of the federal government. This success will soon be made still more apparent by the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency. And this victory has been built upon nothing except those smooth, round pebbles with which we laid the foundations—and the storms of earth and hell shall not prevail against it.

It reminds me of that beautiful island of Capri, on which the rocks are piled in native deformity, but in native strength, upon whose summits I found the ruins of the palaces of Domitian and Nero. Yet when I entered a cavern on the shore, I found that the whole island rested on a foundation of coral.

These are the considerations which present themselves to me on coming among you. I have kept nothing back. Henceforth, if my confidence in the stability of the American Union wavers, I shall come here to learn that the Union is stronger than human ambition, because it is founded in the affection of the American people. If ever I shall waver in my affection for freedom, I shall come up here and renew it—here under the inspiration of one hundred thousand freemen, saved from slavery. Henceforth, these shall not be my sentiments alone, but the sentiments of ALL. Men will come up to Kansas as they go up to Jerusalem. This shall be a sacred city.

For my brethren and companions' sake, then, I say—peace be within your walls, and plenteousness in all your cabins, soon to become palaces. And now, people of Kansas, once more HAIL! and at the same time, Farewell.

THE POLICY OF THE FATHERS OF THE REPUBLIC.

SENECA FALLS, OCTOBER 31, 1860.

A CRISIS in individual life is when a man passes through some perilous accident, or surmounts some apprehended mortal disease; or else when he falls before the danger, or succumbs to the disease and dies. A political crisis, such as we so often hear of, is the period in which a nation—for a nation is but a person, a human person consisting of many persons--surmounts some national disease or avoids some national peril, and takes new assurance and long life, or failing to surmount it, suddenly or slowly languishes and dies. And politicians, availing themselves through the influence of interest or passion, tell us very often that the town in which we live, or the state in which we belong, or the country of which we are members, is in a crisis, misjudging, because a crisis occurs but seldom even in the course of individual life, and at very distant periods in the life of a nation. But on all hands there is an agreement now that this republic of ours is in a crisis, and I, for one confess, as I believe it to be true, if this republic passes safely through this crisis, it takes assurance of long endurance—practically of immortality; and if it fails to pass safely through this crisis, it will languish and die. To know how to pass safely through a crisis, it is necessary to understand its nature, and to understand the nature of the present national crisis it will be necessary for us to go back to the beginning.

I said we must go back to the beginning, and the moment that we go back to the beginning of our national existence we perceive the fact, clear, unmistakable and uncontested, that this nation was to be, not a monarchy, not an aristocracy, but a republican nation. That can be a republican nation only which is a free nation; and if freedom or liberty is a vital principle of every republican government, or every republican state, that principle is that the people must be free and must be equal. When we say that the people of a country

are free and equal, we say precisely that that nation enjoys civil and religious liberty, and that all, practically all, of its citizens enjoy the rights and safety of their persons, of freedom in the pursuit of happiness, which involves freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of suffrage, and above all freedom of religious conscience.

This you will all recognize, at once, as the nature of the republic which our fathers intended to establish, and which we all confess, and the world confesses, that they did establish. It did not mean that every human being within the jurisdiction of the government when it was first established was, or must immediately be, entirely free. That was impossible, because slaves and slavery existed in the land at that time, and there was no process by which every human being in the United States, on the first organization of the government, could be emancipated, if in bondage, and raised up to freedom; but it did mean this: that the great mass of the people were, and should remain forever free; that slavery should be subordinate, inferior in its position to freedom, and that freedom should be the general and normal condition of the country; that thereafter all the changes shall be, not from freedom toward slavery, but from existing and tolerated slavery, upward toward freedom. This was all that could have been done in the country, at that time, and this country was in a better condition to establish a free government, than any other people that had then existed on the face of the globe.

I call your attention, then to this fact, that there were thirteen of those states—that this was not to be a consolidated nation, consisting of only one people, and one jurisdiction alone, like France, or like Russia, but that it did consist of thirteen equal states, and that these states were to remain thereafter, and until the end of time; and each of them should be, in a large degree, sovereign states—and all of them, of course, should be equal. That this was to be in the beginning a republic of thirteen states, and that, as time should advance, the number should increase to twenty, up to thirty—at which standard we have already arrived—and in distant years forty, fifty, or sixty states—a thing not impossible, scarcely improbable, for many to see who are not older than the lad who sits upon the stage before me.

Now none of these states, practically none, with the exception of Massachusetts, scarcely worth noticing—no one of these states had

an entire population of freemen. There were slaves in every state, and slavery was commingled with freemen in each one, and through the whole country. But, nevertheless, freedom was recognized, and not slavery, in founding the federal government, as the element which prevailed in every one of these thirteen states; and what was to be done was to take care that freedom, and not slavery, should predominate in all the other states, which, under any circumstances and at any period, however remote, might be adopted into the Union.

There was, as you see, slavery existing then in every state in the newly formed Union—and there was freedom existing in it, and these two were in conflict. Let the silly person who denies that there is a conflict between freedom and slavery wherever they exist in the country, and that that conflict is irrepressible, answer me. Let him answer me whether, taking the Declaration of Independence, which was the first utterance of the American nation, he does not read there in the very first sentence of that utterance the existence of a conflict between freedom and slavery?

He certainly will read there the declaration that "all men are created equal, and have inalienable rights to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Did they assert a mere truism which all the world accepted, and upon which all the world have based all their institutions, or did they assert a truth that other people beside the American nation denied and rejected? They asserted a truth which only this nation, and none before this had ever asserted, and which was disputed in this country at the time, and was in dispute, and is in dispute still over the whole face of the globe.

Let me ask the silly person who denies that there is an irrepressible conflict between freedom and slavery, whether every page of the history of the United States does not bear testimony to the conflict between freedom and slavery for the period of eighty years that this Union has endured? What else have we had from the beginning but attempts to compromise—compromises and breaches of compromises of the dispute between freedom and slavery—and if it was so in the beginning and has been so through the middle, how is it now? Upon what issue is the American people divided in this political crisis, except a conflict between freedom and slavery? So, unless this conflict shall end in the manner appointed by Him who created and called into existence all nations, as he did all men, and that is in favor of the right, so it will be an irrepressible conflict

until this nation shall cease to exist, and shall give place to some other in which the same conflict shall be renewed.

There was then a conflict between freedom and slavery in the beginning, and our fathers had to choose between freedom and slavery as the elemental and vital principle of the republic. Our fathers, differing from their descendants, widely differing from you, strange that it should be so, were unanimous in accepting and adopting freedom and rejecting slavery as the elemental and vital principle of the republic. And not one statesman of them all proposed at any time that all the American states, all of which practically were then slaveholding states, should continue and remain forever slaveholding states, and that every new state which should come into the Union through the course of ages, should also be a slave state. If there was one such statesman in any one of those thirteen slave states, pray name him to me, because his name and action have escaped my reading of history. Not one statesman of the republic proposed an equilibrium or a balance in which freedom should be one principle and slavery another in the United States. That is to say, that one-half of the states should be free states and that the other half of the states should be slave states, and that each should remain free or slave through all time as they were at the beginning, and that the future states one-half to be admitted to be free and the other half to be slave, and they should remain so forever. If I am mistaken in this, if there was any statesman of that day who proposed an equal balance between freedom and slavery, I pray you to name him to me, because his name has escaped my reading of history. Not one statesman in any part of this republic proposed to leave the matter to accident or choice, to let freedom and slavery balance each other, or the one to prevail over the other, as it might, careless whether freedom was voted up or voted down, whether slavery was voted up or voted down. If there is one of these political philosophers proposing the theory of indifference or practising it, I pray you to name him to me, because I have been unable to find it inscribed upon the history of the fathers of the republic.

Now there was a way in which this Union could have been established upon either of these three principles. There was a way in which this could have been made a republic, not of freedom, but of slavery. And if there had been statesmen who desired such a government, the process would have suggested itself to them, it is very

simple, and they would have propounded it to the convention which formed and to the people who accepted our state and federal constitution; and it was this: Prohibit emancipation in all the thirteen states; prohibit emigration of foreigners from all countries into the United States, or any of them, because foreigners were free men, deny naturalization to the foreigner who is found here, and leave him practically disfranchised, and therefore in the class of slaves; perpetuate the African slave trade, so that for all time to come the future inhabitants of the United States, upon whom they must depend for labor and for the great business of society, should be African slaves; declare slavery to be not only existing and the law of the land in each state, but declare that it shall be perpetual. Declare this and take one step more. Let the federal government, the congress of the United States, shut up the common domain upon which the future states were to be created, that domain stretching between the river Ohio and the great lakes to the Mississippi: declare that that domain shall be open hereafter, not to freemen at all, but only to slaveholders and slavery. Now you see how easy it would have been at that day, by adopting this simple programme, to have made not the free republic which our fathers bequeathed to us, but a slave republic, from the Atlantic ocean to the Mississippi river, and from the St. Lawrence to the St. Mary's, which were the original boundaries of the republic.

There was a way also for the statesmen of that day, if that had been what they desired and what they meant, to make a republic in which freedom and slavery should be held in equilibrium and remain so forever. How was this to be done? Divide the thirteen orginal states so that in just one-half of the territory freedom should exist and slavery be unknown, and in the other half slavery should exist and freedom be unknown. Admit, of all the future states, just one-half free, and the other half slave; open your ports to the emigrant from Ireland, Scotland, England, France, Germany, Holland and Switzerland; admit just one-half of white labor of the country free, keep open the African slave trade, and admit and receive the other half of the labor of African slaves—here you would have had that perfect equilibrium between freedom and slavery which those who oppose the republican party say is exactly the condition in which the country can live and flourish, and to which they propose to bring it by the policy upon which they insist.

There was a way also for a third system to be established—the don't know and don't care system—that is, that it shall be a republic of freedom or slavery, just as time and chance and accident shall determine. How was that to be done? Why, if there had been any statesman of the order of Mr. Douglas at that time, he would have taken great care that the congress of the United States should have no power to abolish the African slave trade, but it should have power to admit at the same time foreign emigrants and naturalize them, and that congress should be pledged by the constitution to admit a state, slave or free, just as it should come when it offered itself, without resistance, and he would have taken good care to have the supreme court bound up so it should not interfere with the question, and when that was done, and when that course had been adopted, then the slaveholders would have been invited to carry as many slaves into the territories—new territories—as they could, and the foreign laborers to go in as freely as they could, and as soon as they got into the territory begin to vote it up or vote it down, or vote both ways, as they chose; or, when they were to vote it up or down, then invite the slaveholders of other states to interfere on the side of slavery, and then, failing to be able to settle it at the ballot box, just resort to cannon and rifle, and what they could not vote up or vote down, they would fight up or fight down.

It is not needful for me to say, that such a republic as would have been adopted upon either of these three principles could not have existed seventy years. It is not necessary to prove that it could not, and therefore I pass it by, although it is my own opinion that a republican government that can stand at all, must stand upon the principle of liberty paramount to slavery. The people of the country, then, having these three systems before them, adopted one entirely different from them all, and that was the principle of making freedom paramount in the federal government, everywhere, so far as they could, to the principle of slavery. We have grown to our present growth upon this principle, and it has become the fixed and settled habit of our national life—we live, hereafter, if we continue in the habit of preserving freedom of labor paramount to slavery, and we perish whenever we change that habit;—for it is with nations as it is with individuals—the nation that forsakes and abandons the habit of health which is essential in its very constitution, declines and perishes as the consequence of the departure. How was this

principle of freedom paramount to slavery established? The fathers encouraged every one of the thirteen original slave states to emancipate their slaves just so soon as they could consistently with the interest and the comfort of society then existing. It proposed to nobody to abolish slavery all at once, to substitute freedom all at once; it is neither the course of nature nor the course of human wisdom to do anything of a sudden; but time enters and is an essential element in all human transactions which are wise. Then they prohibited the African slave trade, not all at once, because that might produce a shock if suddenly done. But they prohibited it after twenty years, and said to the slaveholders and those in the slaveholding interest, "Make good use of your time; twenty years you may import the black bondman into the country, and hold him there, but after that period there shall never be another slave imported into this Union, whether its institutions be free or slave institutions." They took one further step, and that is, they invited the foreigners of all lands, the free men of all lands, of all conditions and all climates, into the country to fill up the vacuum or void which was to be made by preventing the importation of slaves, and declared that on giving evidence of character and loyalty, they should all become citizens of the United States equal with the native; aye, even with the first-born of the republic. They took one further step, and that was, to make all the future states that should be admitted into the Union become, not slave, but free states, by just building a wall along the bank of the Ohio river, where all these new states were to be erected, and said, this shall be free soil, and it shall never be trodden by the foot of the slave, and every state that shall be erected here shall not be a slave but a free state.

Having just accepted these few simple measures, the fathers sat themselves down contentedly and said to themselves: "It has been well and wisely done. True, we have not all free states and universal freedom, and for the present we have more slave states than free; but we have so arranged the forces of freedom and slavery in the balance that in sixty years there will be more free states than slave states; in eighty years there will be twice as many free states as slave states, and in one hundred years there will scarcely be a slave state; and at some period, within a hundred or five hundred or a thousand years, every man under the government of the United States will be a freeman, and slavery anywhere will exist only as a

relic of barbarism and inhumanity." Does any man deny now that this was well and wisely done? If he does, then he must wish that it had never been done—he must wish that this wise and judicious arrangement had never been made. Let us see, then, what would have been the consequence. Take a single state. If this arrangement which I have related to you had not been made, this state of New York, which, in the beginning, when the system was adopted, held every seventeenth person a slave, would have been a slave state now. Does any man living in this state, or out of it, in any slave state, in any foreign country, is there a man who so hates the state of New York, and so much hates the human race that he would be willing to have this, not as it is now, a free state, but a slave state? There is not one wheel on this river that would be in motion if this were a slave state; there is not one mine of salt or iron—and we are not wealthy in mineral resources—that would not have closed up. The city of New York, a metropolis worthy of a great state, a metropolis worthy of a great nation, a metropolis worthy of a great continent, rapidly advancing to be the first and greatest city of modern times, and first, therefore and greatest, of all the cities that ever existed in the great tide of time—what would it have been now if this had been left to be a slave state instead of a free state? Strange inconsistency! You are all contented. Everybody is contented with society as they find it in the state of New York. We would not be changed backward for anything. We must be free. But if there are any who think this condition is confined to the state of New York, go then, through Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, and even Kansas, after the controversy is ended, and I ask where is the human being on the face of this earth that is so hateful of human happiness, so hateful of the good and welfare of his country and of his race, that he would be willing to have freedom excluded from that state, and slavery introduced in its place.

Suppose for a moment, that in this state, instead of adopting the policy of the fathers, making this free, and seeking to make all the other states free within the range of its constitutional powers,—suppose it had been a slave state, what kind of freedom would the free men in it enjoy? What would they be enjoying to-day? Not freedom of speaking just what they think, or writing just what they

think, or thinking just as they please, of worshiping God in every form, with every ritual that suits their own conscience; but they would have liberty to write, to speak, to think, to vote, to pray just exactly what the slaveholders desire them to write, speak, print, vote and pray. Is anybody then discontented or dissatisfied with the existing condition of things in the country? Not a man. Everybody is satisfied that it was rightly and wisely ordered in the beginning. If there be anybody who is discontented, I pray him to speak. Is this country all too free for you? Is there any danger of its ever going to be so much more free as to be too free for you? Is the republic already too great for you, and you would have it less, or contract it in its dimensions? Is the republic too rich, too prosperous, our people too happy for you? Its commerce, the second of any nation in the whole world, is it too broad, is it too enriching, is it too refining, that you would have it reduced? Not at all. Shall the influence of this nation be broken up, and aristocratic and despotic systems extended over the whole world? Do you dislike this, would you have this a miserable slave republic which would be mentioned in the councils of kings and emperors and the conclaves of aristocrats, not with respect and honor, and fear, as it is now, but with scorn, contempt and reproach? No! No! There is nobody wants the country less prosperous, less great, less free, less powerful than it is now.

But, going on just exactly in the track which was laid out for it by the fathers, it is going to be so much greater than it is now, so much broader, so much wiser and happier, aye, and even so much more free, that those who come fifty years after us, will wonder at our contentment with being satisfied with such a country as we then had. Now, does anybody want to arrest it? The way that all this is to happen is by multiplying the free states in the west, and taking care, as fast as possible, to see that slavery is reduced and diminished in the old states, not by any force that anybody is to apply, for there never was force contemplated nor used, but simply by teaching, by example, that compensated labor is more productive of wealth and happiness in a society, than slave labor, that morality is better than crime, and humanity is better than inhumanity, and that virtue is the surest and safest guide to national prosperity and greatness. But if anybody does want anywhere to arrest the growing prosperity and greatness of the republic, there is one simple way to do

it. I can show him exactly how to do it. Encourage all the slave states to continue and to perpetuate slavery forever, reöpen the African slave trade, and open the public domain to slave states instead of free, and the whole thing is done, secured to be done at least, in the twinkling of an eye. I am sure that you do not want such a sad perverseness to come over the people of this country as to produce such a shock and such a change. Rather with me you would continue contented, and with the fathers reducing and circumscribing slavery just as they did, and as vigilantly as they did, and then wait to see Canada and all British America to the shores of Hudson Bay, and Russian America to Behrings Straits, and Spanish America to the Isthmus of Panama, and perhaps to Cape Horn, all coming into this republic as they would come, voluntarily, as they could not be kept from coming,—it would require the sword to prevent,—if you would only admit them as equal states and carry to them the blessings of your free states, but not the curse of slave states.

Well, it is sad to confess that just what I have been stating to you as the great problem of our government, is the very question in this canvass. The question in this canvass is, whether we shall keep this nation a republic of freedom, or reverse all its policy and henceforth make it a republic of slavery. It were better if it were to be a slave republic, better that it were made so in the beginning, than that it should have been deferred to us to have committed such a crime against mankind, and change now from freedom to slavery. When the national pulse is healthiest, when the whole form of the nation is rounded out and full, and when its habit of existence is freedom, to change that by injecting slavery into its veins, would be to smite it immediately with a poison under which it would languish for a time, and dissolve and die. It could have been made a slave republic in the beginning peacefully. It could be made a slave republic now only by revolution, resulting in civil war and anarchy.

But how does this question arise? It arises in this way. There is nobody discontented among us; but south of Mason and Dixon's line there is discontentment, and unhappiness, and despondency, and a feeling amounting almost to despair. South of the Delaware river, I should have said, are six states which, like the other seven, at the beginning were slave states, which declined to take the advice and counsel of the fathers, as the seven did, and kept and continued slavery, and they retain it yet. They are discontented, they are

unhappy. Have they suffered from this being made a free republic? If so, will any one here who sympathizes with them, and they have many of that class, will any one tell me what wrong, what injurious measure any one or all the slave states in this republic have ever suffered from the policy which has made this and kept this a free republic?

Have they not enjoyed freedom? Have they not enjoyed the freedom of having slavery, and has any one deprived them of the right or the power? Has any one enjoined upon them, or enforced upon them, an unwilling duty? Not one. Have they been taxed oppressively? They have submitted to equal taxation, and no other can be enforced. Have they not enjoyed equal representation? Aye, a representation equal to those of the free states, with the addition of three-fifths of all the slaves. They complain of no wrong, of no suffering that they have endured, and they could not complain, for they themselves have administered the government itself for the whole period of fifty years. They make no complaint against the government and its action, as they could not, because they were exercising the government, the free states having resigned it to their hands in contentment. What then is the character and ground of their discontent? Nothing but this: That slavery, confined to the natural increase of slave labor, and being by its nature inert and without vigor and force, that slavery does not produce prosperity for them equal to the prosperity which free labor and freedom produce for the states which abolished slavery. This is the whole of all the complaint they have—that we of the free states prosper more than they of the slave states; they under the system of their choice, however, and we under the system of our choice. They have still another complaint, and that is this: That free states multiply so that where we had in the beginning only one free state, and they had the other twelve, they have now only fifteen slave states, and we have eighteen free states, without counting the last and youngest one, which they still continue to deny to us.

This discontentment it is that works upon them to desire to produce a change. What is that change now which they desire and which they are seeking to produce, and can be produced only by our consent, and we can do nothing without taking their voice? It is to make no more free states, or to make less, or to reduce the number of free states in the republic by admitting hereafter slave states, and

enable them to provide the material for these slave states by consenting to reöpen the African slave trade, and thereby reject the free and voluntary emigrant from Europe, excluding with him our own children from the common soil of the republic.

And now I come to the question, how it happens that we are in the crisis which I describe and confess? It is that for the sake of peace and harmony we have gone so far with them, conceded to their discontent so long, that they have proceeded in direct opposition to the action of all the social causes in the country. They have procured from the congress of the United States laws, from the president of the United States judgments, which all lead directly to enable them, if we do not prevent the further passage of such laws, if we do not prevent the further issuing of such edicts, if we do not prevent the further registering of such decrees, to reöpen the African slave trade, causing the territories which shall come in hereafter as states to be slave territory and not free territory, or at least so large a number of them as to subvert the balance of freedom which has been established, and to introduce slavery as an element in the constitution of the republic.

Now, fellow citizens, I speak not unconscious of the place where I stand. I am surrounded by citizens of the county of Seneca. That one county, which has been known to me intimately for a long period, that one county lying between two beautiful lakes, transparent as crystal, with a soil as rich as ever the human hand subjected to supply the wants of man, a county in the very center of western New York, which stood persistently,—I will not say obstinately,—stood fixed in resisting and in dissenting from the people of all the counties of all the region around it, and maintaining continually toleration, not for freedom, but for slavery, concession not to freedom, but concession to slavery, and for nearly forty years that I have known it, a balance of one or two hundred votes turned the scale, if ever it did turn, in favor of freedom (God be praised!) and the balance turned it nine-tenths of the time I think in favor of human bondage. I know where I stand. I know where you stand. I know that this persistency in maintaining and defending slavery here, while not you but your neighbors of Cayuga and Wayne, Ontario and Tompkins, and all the other people of this state, have arrested the footsteps of the invader of slavery in Kansas, and turned him back.

I know you have not had this design—God knows there is no such perverseness among men that they can be insensible to the difference between right and wrong, justice and injustice, liberty and slavery, humanity and cruelty. You have done it simply because you would not listen. You had your guides, grown up men as you are; from childhood up you had your parties—your whig party, and your American party, and your democratic party. And they had their leaders, and you must take care of the welfare of your leaders. You must see that they were sent to the legislature, and sent to congress, sent to the public offices, and you had no time to listen to those who told you that the man that you call your leader is but the ephemeris of the day, that he perishes to-morrow, but freedom or slavery is the interest of humanity for all countries, for all ages.

TRADE IN SLAVES.[1]

We may call slavery by gentle names or modest terms, but slavery is nothing less than the trade in slaves, for it makes merchandise of the bodies and souls of men. The fifteen states have the right and have the power, the unquestionable and undeniable power, to carry on this trade in slaves within those fifteen states themselves. We do not interfere with them. We have no right to interfere with them. They are sovereign on that subject, and are exempt from our control. But when it comes to the Federal Union—the Union which is the government over us all—there their right to trade in slaves in the territories of the United States has ceased, because the constitution is a constitution to establish justice, not injustice; to maintain peace not by force, but by the consent of the governed, and to perpetuate, not the curse of slavery, but the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity forever. This Union is this nation—is this empire of thirty millions of people. It is not made for mere trade, much less for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is made for the happiness of the people, for the development of the material resources of the country, to guarantee peace and safety to every citizen in this broad land, and to guarantee him in the full enjoyment of all his rights of life, liberty and property. It opens to him this vast continent for the pursuit of happiness, and by its power acting on the governments of the old world and of the new, it makes the American citizen the citizen of the world.

[1] Extract from a speech at La Crosse, Wis., September 14, 1860.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND SECESSION.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 2, 1860.

It would surprise, I doubt not, the citizens of the metropolis, who meet daily on 'Change, and who are found at night in the political and social circles, if I were to claim that I, whose home is in a distant rural district, feel an equal interest and an equal pride in the prosperity and greatness of New York. And yet I know not why I should not. The city, and the country around which sustains it, are not separate and isolated from each other, but they are parts of one whole. The town stands by common consent for town and country. Certainly an inhabitant of the suburbs may justly feel that he shares in all the pride and in all the glory of the city, as he certainly is seldom altogether exempt from its misfortunes and disasters. But when a city extends its dimensions so far on all sides as to make the state its suburbs, and when, extending still further, it embraces the most remote regions of the country within its suburbs, then he who lives outside, as well as he who resides within the city gates, feels his heart warm with the impulses of patriotism, for the town and the country have become one.

In the spirit, then, of such a pride in the city in which we stand as a patriot may feel, I shall hope that I can speak profitably, if I treat of the political questions of the canvass in their relations to the metropolis of the country. In the beginning of our history the city of New York was as unconscious of its then future destiny as the country was ignorant itself of the destiny of the city. At the beginning of this century, it was a small provincial town. It had just lost the seat of the federal government. Its inland navigation was all included in a sloop navigation from New York bay to the overslaugh at Albany, together with the navigation of Long Island sound. Public-spirited citizens of New York cast about to see what they could do to continue the prosperity which New York had then recently enjoyed in consequence of its being the federal capital.

They concluded that it was useless to try to make a commercial city on New York bay, because the commerce of the country was destined to be enjoyed by Boston and Philadelphia; and the wise men of the day, after casting around for all other resources, finally concluded that this island, upon which we stand, was exactly the best spot in the whole country for the establishment of schools, which, by bringing in pupils from large portions of the surrounding country, would make a tolerably fair town on Manhattan island. I do not know whether the experiment was attempted, but if it was, there is no doubt that New York was soon distanced in the race of education by Princeton and New Haven. I do not know whether the people of New Jersey and the people of Connecticut had better qualifications for instructing the young, but I must confess—and I speak it, nevertheless, with reverence—that the Scotch, the English and the Irish schoolmasters and the Dutch, which New York city then employed, if they were to be judged by those they sent out into the rural districts in my childhood, were not altogether the best qualified persons for the task of public education.[1]

Manhattan island fell, by the dispensation of a wise Providence, within the circuit of a great state and a great nation, and although that state and that nation thought little and cared less for the city of New York, yet, like a great state and a great nation that thought deeply, they thought long and they cared wisely for themselves. The state owned a broad region, rich in forest, mineral, agricultural and manufacturing resources, lying south of the St. Lawrence and west of the falls at Cohoes. Any one could see that a great and flourishing state must arise here if this great region could be peopled with free men, intelligent men, and if its settlers could be furnished with facilities for access to this, the only seaport within the state. The United States owned a still greater domain, lying just west of the domain of New York, stretching to the Mississippi river, and bounded north by the lakes and south by the river Ohio. Everybody did see that the United States must become a great nation if they could spread the civilization of intelligent freemen over this vast domain, and could connect the seat of that flourishing portion of the country with an adequate seaport on the Atlantic coast. Manhattan island stood just exactly in the point to which all the

[1] Here there were cries of "Three cheers for William H. Seward, the father of free schools!"

commerce of western New York, all the commerce of western America must converge, if only the right policy was adopted to concentrate that commerce here. To make this great state and this great nation it required legislation; not any exercise of power or of force, but only proper and wise legislation to direct and invigorate the existing social forces among us. Therefore, nobody at that day proposed to conquer any additional territory, or to subjugate foreign nations for the purpose of increasing the greatness of our own. What did it require? You will see in a moment what it required from what was done. In all the state of New York, then, there were only three hundred thousand inhabitants, and of these, every seventeenth person was an African slave. There were in the United States only four millions of people, and of this sum half a million were African slaves. Everybody could see that a great state could not be built in New York upon the basis of a population consisting of only three hundred thousand souls—a white population. Everybody could see that a great nation could not be created in the United States upon a basis of only four millions of souls, and that at that time the element of increasing force was the increase of African negroes instead of white citizens, as well in the state of New York as in the United States. The reason was an obvious one. The African slave trade was in full force, and it was vigorously exercised for the profits of the white man; and much as men may denounce the assertion of an irrepressible conflict between freedom and slavery in the same community, it was apparent and manifest then that this importation of African negroes amounted to an exclusion of European freemen. There was a bounty, a bonus upon negroes, and there were expenses, burdens, costs and losses upon white men.

I do not know how it is—it is for these philosophers who deny the irrepressible conflict to-day to tell how it is—that so early as that it was, as it has been to this day, that wherever a state will admit imported African negroes, voluntary emigrants from Ireland, England and Germany will not go. What was to be done? To make this great state, and this great nation, manifestly required to diminish the vigor of the African labor force—to diminish it and arrest it, and on the other hand to stimulate and invigorate the force of free emigration. Does anybody doubt that? It required, secondly, a system of internal improvements to be commensurate with the great-

ness of the regions which were thus to be inhabited, and it required that the free labor population should be educated and trained so as to be able to maintain a republican government. This thing required the coöperation of the federal legislature, and of the state legislature. The federal legislature addressed themselves to their work in the convention which framed the constitution, and in the congress which succeeded the constitution. These three federal legislative efforts settled the whole matter in a manner simple and practical. It did not extirpate or attempt to extirpate African slavery. It did not emancipate or attempt to emancipate the African slaves. It did not even arrest at once the African slave trade; but it did encourage all the slave states to remove slavery themselves as soon as they practically could without disturbing the peace and order and the interests of society, of which the states were left the sole judges. The next step that they took was to prohibit the African slave trade, not immediately, but after the expiration of twenty years, and to declare that from and after that time no African slave should ever be introduced into the United States. They took one step now on the side of free labor. They encouraged free labor by federal laws, by inviting the emigrant from Europe, the exiled poor and penniless, no matter whether he were catholic or protestant, or Jew, or Greek, or Gentile—no matter whether he were an Englishman, or a German, or a Pole, or a Hungarian—they invited him to come; and insomuch as the cost of transportation was great and the voyage hazardous, they declared that he might sell his labor which he should perform for years after his arrival to pay the expenses of his transportation to this free land from his native soil. They took one other broad and liberal step, and that was, they declared, by laws of uniform naturalization, that the freeman immigrating into this country, from whatever land, should, after sufficient probation to establish his character and his loyalty, be admitted as a citizen of the republic, and of every state in it, too, whether free state or slave state, on the same footing with the native born. They took one more step, more effective than all the rest, and that is that they shut up the whole of the unoccupied, unsettled, national domain, upon which all the future states were to be erected—they shut it up against slavery and the slave forever. This is what the federal legislative authority did.

Hear, now, what the states did. The prize of commercial greatness and glory was equally sought by the thirteen states. Seven seconded the wise—I had almost said, and will say—the pious policy of the federal government, and abolished slavery from all their borders. Not all at once—not by violence—not by confiscation; but they took such measures in the year 1800 or thereabouts, that whereas, in the year 1800 every twenty-eighth person was a slave, in 1828 not one slave was found upon the soil of the state of New York. Six others of the states followed in the same policy. But six more, —the more southern states—declined to pursue that policy, but they still determined to compete for the great national commercial prize. The state of New York had, in its early days, enlightened statesmen—men who had not learned the demoralizing doctrine of the times, that virtue and freedom enfeebled the state, and that slavery is the necessary element of national greatness. Among the great men and great statesmen and patriots of that early period were Christopher Colles, Hamilton, Jay, the Clintons, Tompkins and Rufus King; and coming later, but not unworthy of the noble association, John W. Francis, of the city of New York. The thoughts of these enlightened men, then called speculation and imagination, filled the age in which they lived, and they projected, and there have since been completed all the great thoroughfares of commerce, from New York bay to the St. Lawrence and the lakes. And other states have continued the work until these same channels of intercourse and commerce between the city of New York and other portions of the continent now reach the very borders of our civilization in the west. One thing more was necessary, and that was education—education for a free people. The foundation of a system of education, equally fair, just and impartial, among all the classes of the citizens, was laid in the state at an early day, and after much attention was finally introduced and established permanently in the city of New York. Here, fellow citizens, I have told you in these very few words the whole foundation of all the prosperity of the state of New York, which now, after a period of only sixty years, counts a population of four millions, and a commerce surpassing all the other states, as well as the foundation of the prosperity of the United States, which now, instead of four millions, counts thirty millions—and which have established in the city of New York, as the one port which alone was adequately adapted to the commerce inland, sur-

passing that of any other capital, and a foreign commerce second only to one in the world. Surely if, instead of being now before the citizens of this metropolis of this great state of the United States, I had told this story to a stranger in a foreign land, he would have said: "You have told me of that Atlantis—that happy republic which the ancient philosophers conceived, and the ancient poets sung, and which the hard experience of mankind has hitherto proved to be an impossibility and a fabrication."

And now for the future of New York. I, myself, when I was even older than some beardless hearers before me, sought recreation and rest out of the city of New York by hanging around the open tomb of the Potter's field, and what is now Washington square. I think a very able and ingenious writer in a morning newspaper yesterday called my attention to the fact that, to a certainty established by demonstration, within a period of one hundred and fifty years the population of the United States will be three hundred millions—that it would surpass China. I doubt not his figures are accurate. What, then, is it to be fifty years hence?—for it is a gradual progression. What a hundred years hence—only a hundred years—is to be the magnitude and the population of the city of New York? Take into view only one agency—two agencies—the combination of the great state of New York and of the United States in increasing their own greatness, and the greatness and glory and magnificence of New York city follow as its legitimate result. This commerce is to be soon not merely a national commerce, but the commerce of the continent of America. I need not tell you that the port which enjoys the commerce of the continent of America, commands at once the commerce of the globe. You have now seen what it is, and you have seen what has produced it. What remains is to consider what is needful to secure that future for the city, as well as for the country for which you as well as myself are necessarily and naturally and justly so ambitious. What can it be, my dear friends? What can it be that is needful to be done but to leave things to go on just exactly as they have gone on hitherto; to leave slavery to be gradually, peaceably circumscribed and limited hereafter, as it has been hitherto, and to leave the increase of our own white population, and the increase by foreign immigration to go on just exactly as they are already going on, and to leave the canals and railroads in full operation as they are, and to leave your systems of education and toleration to

stand on the basis on which they now rest. There, if you please, is what I understand by republicanism. I do not know what complexion it wears to your glasses, but I do know that men may call it black, or green, or red, but to me it is pure, unadulterated republicanism and Americanism.

That is the whole question in this political canvass. There is no more. If you elect that eminent, and able, and honest and reliable man, Abraham Lincoln, to the presidency, and if, as I am sure you will during the course of the next four years, you constitute the United States senate with a majority like him, and at the present election establish the house of representatives on the same basis, you have then done just exactly this: you have elected men who will leave slavery in the United States just exactly where it is now, and who will do more than that—who will leave freedom in the United States, and every foot and every acre of the public domain, which is the basis of future states, just exactly as it is now. There are laws of congress; there are edicts of presidents and governors; there are judgments or pretended judgments of the supreme court, which have a tendency if they should stand, and if they should be continued and renewed by future presidents, and future congresses, and future judges of the supreme court, to change all this thing, to put slavery over into the free states again, and to send slavery into, and freedom out of the territories of the national domain. All that we propose to do, all that you will do, and, God be thanked, all that it is needful to do, is to take care that no more such laws, no more such edicts, no more such judgments or pretended judgments shall be rendered. Why, then, since it is so simple, shall you not go on in the same way which was begun by your fathers, and which has been prosecuted so long and with so much success? They tell us that we are to encounter opposition. Why, bless my soul, did anybody ever expect to reach a fortune, or fame, or happiness on earth, or a crown in Heaven, without encountering resistance and opposition? What are we made men for but to encounter and overcome opposition arrayed against us in the line of our duty. But whence comes this opposition? What is it? I have already alluded to the fact that fifty years ago, when the seven northern states abolished slavery the six southern ones did not see their interest in the same way, and they declined to second or adopt the policy of the day and of the age, and having retained slavery, and the world found out

just about the same time the usefulness of cotton as a fabric or material for human clothing, and an invention was made which rendered its manufacture easy.

Then the slave states, retaining their slave labor, proceeded to build up a great interest on the growth of cotton, and when they had grown cotton, and made it a great material interest in the country, they then fell down before it, and did homage to it. I do not say they paid worship to it; but they anointed it king, and they pronounced allegiance to cotton to be a political duty. Did anybody interfere with that homage? Did anybody complain of it? Never. They were men at liberty, like ourselves, to raise a commercial and political king—a social king—within the republic. But they set up the throne in our midst, and said that we must bend and bow to cotton. But from that requirement we have modestly but firmly—not always very firmly, neither—but with tolerable persistence, declined to comply. Now they find that this system does not build up great states like New York, but on the other hand that the six states which pursued their system have remained stationary, or relatively so. The greatest and finest site for commerce on this continent is New Orleans, and in early life I made a pilgrimage there to see whether it was not true that New Orleans was to supersede and supplant New York, the capital of my native state, as the seat of commerce on this continent. I found that whereas there were some ten times the population in New York that there was in New Orleans, that it was increasing in a ratio of such magnitude that when New Orleans would have a quarter of a million New York would have a million and a half. Shall I tell you the reason? I found it in the fact that when I went out in the night in the city of New York, I saw the cobbler's light twinkling in his window in the gray of the morning or late at night. I saw everything *made*, as well as sold, in New York; but when I came to the city of New Orleans I found there that everything was sold and nothing was made. After trying in vain to find any article of human raiment that was made in New Orleans, I did see upon a sign opposite the St. Charles hotel this inscription: "Wagons, carts and wheelbarrows made and sold here." I said, I have found one thing that is made in New Orleans! coarse wagons, carts and rough and rude wheelbarrows, but on crossing to inspect the matter a little more minutely, before entering it in my notes, I found that I had

overlooked some words printed in smaller letters, "at New Haven," and that the sign was rightly to be read: "Wagons, carts and wheelbarrows made at New Haven and sold here." Fellow citizens, this is not a reproach. It is not spoken reproachfully, it would ill become me to so speak it. But it is their system. They employ slaves, and in New York—I was going to say that we employ, but I think I will reverse it and say that freemen employ their masters, the manufacturers. This is but an illustration. The principle is the same in every department of industry and manufacture.

Now the slave states not only build no great cities, but they build no great states, compared with these states—these free states. There is one other distinction, and that is, the free states multiply and replenish the continent with free states, but the slave states fail to multiply and replenish the continent with slave states. And they say that the reason is not in the nature of slavery and freedom, relatively, themselves, but in the injustice of not allowing them to establish slave territory; and they are going to say next, as they logically must, that they should reöpen the African slave trade, and so furnish the supplies for slavery. The opposition is founded upon these facts; is it reasonable to concede to it? We cannot concede to it unless we are willing to wreck the prosperity, and growth, and greatness of our city, of our state and of our country. That would seem an end of the argument, but they then resort to terror and to menace. They tell us that they will withdraw their trade from the city of New York, unless she will vote—unless her citizens will vote—as they require them to vote—as their supposed interest dictates. Is it best to yield to that? Why, New York is not a province of Virginia or of Carolina, any more than it is a province of New Jersey or Connecticut. New York is the metropolis of the country. New York must be the metropolis of the continent. Her commerce, like her principles, must be elevated, equal, just, impartial toward every state. Toward freedom, at least, if it must be tolerant of slavery. But they proceed to tell us that if we do not concede to their demands they will secede and dissolve the Union. Will they? Shall we then surrender? That involves the question whether they will secede and dissolve the Union if we do not. What then is it we propose to do which they require us not to do? Why, it is simply to vote for the man we prefer over the three men, or the no man which they prefer. Is there any offense in that? That is just

what the constitution says we may do, and insomuch as there must necessarily be differences of opinion among men, the constitution requires every man to vote, not for the person somebody else has selected, but the man he himself prefers to have elected. Well, they say that they must nevertheless take offense, and we ask them why, if this is right? "Why, yes, so far you are all right," say they. "Why, then, will you dissolve?" They reply: "We will dissolve because that Mr. Lincoln and a republican congress will commit aggressions upon us after they are elected." "Very well," we say, "but is it not prudent—is it not reasonable—to wait for them to be elected first, and then to commit the aggressions, or attempt to commit them?" They answer, "No; we cannot afford to wait for the overt act, because that overt act may never be committed, and if it shall be committed we shall have become so much demoralized that we cannot resist after that." Well, I will not argue the latter point, for I do believe better of them than they proclaim of themselves. I know their humanity, their spirit, their courage and their chivalry, and I know enough of human nature to know also, that he that waits until an overt act is committed before he strikes back, will be able to recover his rights a thousand times sooner than he who strikes before any overt act is committed.

But why shall we expect that the president, Mr. Lincoln, and his cabinet, and the congress, will commit aggressions against the slave states? They cannot do it constitutionally, and what they cannot constitutionally do cannot be done. Besides, who are these men who are destined to commit these unconstitutional aggressions? They are citizens of the United States, chosen by their fellow citizens, as, if not altogether the best, yet from the best of every part of these United States. Are they less likely to be honest, and just, and wise, and prudent statesmen than the men selected from the same constituency who have heretofore been chosen to fill the same places? Aye, they tell us this republican party is driven on by enthusiasts, and madmen, and fanatics, and these will control instead of being restrained by their associates. This republican party that next Tuesday is to elect Abraham Lincoln president of the United States, what will it be but a majority of the American people? If it is less than that it cannot elect anybody, and if it elects anybody it will be precisely the same American people that has tolerated the government in the abuse of constitutional powers, out of tenderness

to the south and to the slave states, for a period of fifty years. It will be as forbearing still as it can be, and maintain the principles of freedom, and to maintain those principles as I have already shown you, involves no action of the government in any unconstitutional mode.

The election of a chief magistrate of a great republic of thirty millions brings every party and every interest to use the best arguments to sustain its cause that it has. We give them the arguments which have been submitted to you so often here, and which I have attempted to renew to-night. They give us in return—what? Denunciation and threat. Well, these are not a very effective, they are not a very logical form of argument, but they are not to be blamed who use them for that—they are all the arguments they have. And what is it our duty to do? To threaten back again? To fulminate menace for menace and denunciation for denunciation? No; but to listen and hear with patience, with kindness, with fraternal feeling and sympathy. For we do expect them to hear our arguments, and our arguments are much harder to bear than theirs. I do not think these threats before election are evidences of revolution or disunion after the election, for the simple reason that I have always found that the man who does intend to strike a fatal blow does not give notice so long beforehand. And for ten, aye, twenty years, these threats have been renewed, in the same language and in the same form, about the first day of November every four years, when it happened to come before the day of the presidential election.

I do not doubt but that these southern statesmen and politicians think they are going to dissolve the Union, but I think they are going to do no such thing; and I will tell you in a very few words why. He who in this country thinks that this government and this constitution can be torn down, and that this Union of states can be dissolved, has no faith—first, in the constitution; he has no faith in the Union, no faith in the people of the states, no faith in the people of the Union, no faith in their loyalty, no faith in reason, no faith in justice, no faith in truth, no faith in virtue. I am not unwilling to see the members of that class of the American people brought up, so that we may see them altogether. For my part, I, on the contrary, have faith in the constitution, faith in the Union, faith in the people of the states, faith in the people of the Union, faith in freedom, faith in justice, faith in virtue, and faith in humanity. The

constitution and the Union have stood eighty years only upon the foundation of such a faith existing among the American people. It will stand and survive this presidential election, and forty presidential elections after; aye, I trust a hundred and a thousand, because the people, since the government was established, have grown wiser, more just, humane and virtuous than they were when it was established.

SECESSION AND DISUNION.[1]

It has been said that Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana and Florida and South Carolina will go out, and then the Union will be dissolved. They say, "you will not try to take us back; you will not dare to imbrue your hands in brothers' blood to reëstablish by force of conquest a Union which we have repudiated and dissolved." They are right. We do not propose to do any such thing. If it were possible I should like to see the experiment of old Massachusetts going out and endeavoring to carry Plymouth rock with her, or I would like to see New York go out and carry the harbor and Catskill mountains with her. What do you think the rest of the states would say? I think they would fold their arms and see whether they behaved themselves, and they would let them stay out just as long as they behaved themselves. Well, what would they do if they got out and did not behave themselves? If New York should levy taxes and imposts, and instead of paying them into the national exchequer should keep them on her own account, that would not be behaving well. Those who think that for nothing or for any imaginary cause, the Union is to be dissolved or destroyed, have no idea of the nature of the government under which they live, or of the character of the people. Go on, then, and do your duty. The lesson of public life is one that is easy to be learned. It resolves itself simply into this—to ascertain, as you always can, what, in the day in which you live, is the great work for the welfare of mankind; do that work fearlessly, in the love of your fellow men and in the fear of God, and the Union will survive you and me and your posterity for a thousand years.

[1] Extract from a speech at La Crosse, Wis., Sept. 14, 1860.

THE NIGHT BEFORE THE ELECTION.

AUBURN, NOVEMBER 5, 1860.

THE question, looking through this election to-morrow, and forward through many elections, presses home upon us,—whatever may be the result, auspicious as I am almost sure it will be,—shall freedom, justice and humanity ultimately and in the end prevail; are these republican institutions of ours safe and permanent? I have sought and entered the hall of prophecy. I may not tell you just where it stands, but this much I can say, that its entrance is through native forest shades, from the water's edge of a deep and flowing river. I entered it, not irreverently, not unconscious of the presumption of attempting to explore the will of the God whose rule, however men may deny or profess, is higher law. The two gigantic figures, Time and Destiny, which guarded the approach to the altar, seemed to relax their grim features as I passed, and the one dropped his scythe, and the other balanced for a moment the hour glass which he held in his hand. I learned from the oracle that the powers above favor the perpetuation of these institutions, and that they are never to fall by the hand of any foreign enemy; that they are to be saved or to be lost by the action of the American people; that a great danger, a danger that has been long gathering, is at this very moment being passed, and that this danger once passed, there is assurance of long life, aye, of immortality to the institutions of American freedom. I asked for a sign, but the oracle replied to me, "why do this generation look for a sign? I say unto you that no sign shall be given to this generation, but a rule shall be given to them adequate to every emergency, and that rule is, *let the American people rule their own spirit.*"

This people are human, and because they are human, they have accidental and temporary interests and passions and prejudices to mislead them; but also, because they are human, they have reason to conduct them through all temptations and all perils, in the way

of wisdom. A mysterious Providence has permitted, does always permit, error to exist everywhere, cotemporaneously with truth, wrong with right, freedom with slavery; and between these different powers there is always an irrepressible conflict. That conflict is the trial of human virtue; a triumph of the good over the bad constitutes the perfection of human nature. Slavery was probably essential to the success of the institutions of republicanism. That continually provoking conflict, as continually stimulated virtue, and the love of freedom. The fathers, rejecting the sinister counsels of interest and suppressing passions and prejudice, surveyed the continent when they established our government, and they adopted the policy which alone was possible. They could not extirpate slavery at a blow. Probably it had been unwise if they had attempted it; but they had adopted a policy marked equally by sagacity and by benevolence, which is told in a very few words. Its effect was to be the abridgment of the power and duration of slavery by practicable, peaceful means, and the invigoration and ultimate establishment of universal freedom. How this was to be done, requires as few words to tell. The African slave trade, which was then exercised in bringing slaves to do the cultivation of the whole continent—and if it had continued, would have covered the land with savage Africans stolen from their native land—was to be abolished after twenty years, during which time the American people might, as they could, procure supplies of free labor from oppressed and groaning Europe, to supply its place. The states were encouraged and stimulated to provide, by acts of gradual emancipation, for the removal of slavery altogether. The whole of the public domain, then unoccupied, lying northwest of the Ohio river, was set apart exclusively for freedom, and for the erection of new and future free states. Free emigration from all the nations of Europe, of whatever faith or language, was invited by the permission given to the emigrant to pledge his labor for a term of years, so that he might pay the cost of his passage. And to all these was added that boon of boons, that offer, the richest that any nation ever had to give,—an equal citizenship by naturalization to the immigrant of whatever race or name, or lineage, with the native born.

You see how simple this system was. Mark, now, while I tell you in a few words how effective it was. Within twenty years the African slave trade ceased, and never until one year ago did the soil

of America again bear the tread of a native African bondman. Seven of the states rapidly removed slavery by prospective laws, which, while they deprived no man of what he called his property, but left his slave to be his slave for life, still, in a period of twenty-five years, there remained on the soil of those states not one native born or imported African slave. And whereas, in this state of New York of ours, on the day when it became independent, every seventeenth inhabitant was a slave, in the year 1825, not one slave was found upon its soil. And the redemption came under the invitation of that liberal law, from Germany, France, Holland, England, Scotland and Ireland, and they became naturalized without question as to their former allegiance, or their religious faith, and they are now our brethren, and by ties of kindred are mixed and mingled with the American people. There is scarcely one man or woman who can trace to a parentage of one nation of Europe an undivided lineage. The blood of the Dane and Hungarian—the Irishman and the German—the Frenchman and Englishman—are intermingled until we have become the descendants and representatives of enlightened Christian nations throughout the whole continent of Europe.

And then five new states rose upon that public domain, and all of them free states; and this process still being continued that five added to the other seven which had emancipated, making twelve, has already been increased, until whereas twelve of the original thirteen states were slave states, now eighteen of the states are free states, and only fifteen are slave states. As it had been ordered wisely, so all was going on prosperously; and at the expiration of the present century slavery would either have ceased to exist, or have been languishing or dying in the midst of what would have been practically universal liberty, but for one of those singular accidents, one of those strange events which, occurring in the course of human affairs, produces a reäction, and for a time the cause which was suppressed, goes forward, and the cause which was expected to triumph, recedes. That accident was nothing more than that an ingenious countryman of ours, and a lover of freedom as much as you or I, invented a machine by which he could, with greater ease, extract the seeds from the fibers in cotton balls, and thus, giving a cheaper value to cotton, and increasing the demand for it, for fabrics of human wear, cotton became the production of slave labor in six slave states, or in a portion of them, and became king in those states, commanded

emancipation to cease, shut foreigners out from their ports, demanded a rescinding of all the laws which forbid slavery to spread over the American soil, demanded room for new slave territories and new slave states, and began the dreadful work of preparation for the restoration of the African slave trade.

You know too well to need that I should repeat it, the rapidity and violence of that reäction. You know how it bought up parties, and statesmen and capitalists through all of the free states, and moulded them as the image-maker moulds the moistened plaster, to its demands. You know how that under the very first earnest, vehement, violent demand of slavery, Missouri and Arkansas were admitted into the Union, slave states, by a people under the influence of terror, who had, only twenty years before, abolished the African slave trade, and denied slavery another acre of American soil. You know how Texas, a free country in Mexico, was overrun, first by slaveholders with slaves, and then brought into the American Union, with the consent of yourselves, that five slave states might be made out of its soil. You know how California and Mexico and Utah, free lands, free soil, inhabited by men of free speech and free thought, were conquered and brought into the Union, with the expectation—only baffled by the perseverance of a few men in despair, of whom I was one—of establishing slavery upon the Pacific coast. And you know, finally, how presidents and cabinets, ministers and foreign ministers, and at last the judges, came to confess a faith, alien from the constitution, and alien from the spirit of all our institutions, that the normal condition of every territory under the flag of the United States is not freedom but slavery, and that no power existing on the soil, no power existing in other states, no power existing in the congress of the United States, or in any department of the federal government, can challenge it, and say, "How came you or what do you here?"

This was the reäction, and it culminated only six years ago. Never, never was a nation more thoroughly demoralized. The whig party, that had affected sympathy for freedom, faltered and failed in the hour of trial, and went down. The democratic party, bolder than ever, became the unblushing advocate of slavery, ceased to be longer, or to pretend to be, a party of human freedom, but became a party of human bonds. There was no party for freedom. Jealousies were engendered between American free born freemen,

and the voluntary citizens, and at the time when both should have been engaged in rescuing the constitution, which secured the soil for them and their children, and their children's children, as a patrimony for freedom, they were engaged in internecine hostilities, the only effect of which could be to let slavery go roaming over the whole territories.

Such, my friends, was the real condition of things when I addressed you in the park on South street, only four years ago. You were a thoughtless, an excited, a bewildered people. I saw a party forming for freedom, but it was unorganized and discordant, and filled with mutual jealousies. It was the only hope for freedom, but it failed, and it seemed as if it must fail, though it "charmed never so wisely," to win the American people. It seemed to me then that I saw the good angel of my country rising up and bidding her a last farewell.

But now all is changed. The elements of freedom which that republican party took in at that day are so invigorating, so renewing that they have within four years made it a mighty, yes, an unconquerable host. They have taken the reins of the state government in almost every one of the free states, and they lay close siege to what are left in the hands of slavery. They appear strong and vigorous, and have already achieved free speech, free thought and free debate in three slave states, Delaware, Maryland and Missouri, and the battle recedes immediately after this contest, from the free states into the slave states; and the slaveholders, instead of boasting that they are national, and we republicans, are sectional, are already beginning to feel what it is to be attempting to extend and fortify an institution which is purely sectional, into territories that belong to the nation, against the will of the nation.

It has been long that this reäction has been working, and its history will bring out into a new light controversies that to all around us seemed to be already buried in the past. You, laboring men, and especially you of foreign birth, naturalized citizens, can you tell me why it is that you are here among these men in this community, and in the employment of men whom you accuse so often with sympathy with the negro to your prejudice? Why is it that you are here in a land that you call a land of abolitionists? Why are you not in Virginia and in North Carolina and in South Carolina and in Louisiana, among the slave drivers whom you ap-

plaud and approve for their inhumanity to the negro? It is because slavery will not tolerate one of you upon its soil. You manufacturers, whose mills have been so often put in motion only to encounter hostile legislation in congress under the influence of the slave power of the slave states, will you tell me why it is that the government of the United States maintains, as its true and settled policy that an American citizen must carry all his materials to the manufacturers and workshops of England to be wrought up into fabrics by the mechanics, artisans and manufacturers of England, and must send his wheat, his corn, his beef and his pork to support those manufacturers in England, instead of bringing the educated and trained artists and machinists of England here to set up his mills, to put his wheels in motion upon the banks of the Mohawk, the Owasco, the Seneca and the Niagara rivers?

The explanation is a simple one; slavery wants as little of the industry of the white man in the nation as possible. Can you tell me why it is that the expenses of the government, which have risen in the period of thirty-two years from ten millions of dollars, to eighty, ninety and a hundred millions of dollars annually must be levied in such a way as to discourage American manufacturers, and that the deficiency, if there be any, of revenue, must be paid out of the sales of the public lands of the United States at a dollar and a quarter per acre, when there are in every city, in every town, in every village, and in every hamlet of the land, poor, unfortunate white men, with their families, seeking and asking for a living upon this public domain,—and willing to convert it into farms, yielding and paying revenue to the United States? It is simply because slavery is unwilling that the free white man should go there. Can you account for the obstinate resistance to the enlargement of the Erie canal, continued so long, on any other ground? Can you tell me why it was that twenty years ago, this whole state was filled with alarm because equal and free education was being extended to the children of the catholic and the foreigner, upon the ground that, as the children of the foreigner were to be future members of the state, it was important, not more to them than to the state itself, that they should be prepared for citizenship?[1] Oh! then the Bible was in danger. Oh! then the protestant church

[1] See Vol. I, p. xiii, Vol. II, pp. 206, 216.

was to go down. All the hostility to education was the suggestion of slavery in order that free white men might not come to swell the population of the free states, and swarm into the new states beyond the Alleghany mountains.

But all this is ended. The agents, and the parties who were deceived, misled and perverted, who opposed the interests of freedom, have all within six years fallen and disappeared. The whig party once cherished by so many of us, and relied upon with faith and hope against evidence, proved unfaithful at last and perished, and I know not one sound thinking man, however much he was attached to it, that laments its loss. The American party that sought to deceive itself with the idea that it could secure forbearance for freedom in the new alliance formed with slaveholders in the south, suddenly, even more suddenly disappeared, and there is not one man living to vindicate its memory. And so the democratic party had a form and existence a year ago. Where is it now. It has changed its form as often as a guilty dream. It was single, united, unterrified and violent a year ago. Six months passed and it wore two forms in hostile attitude against each other. Six months later the two disappeared, and now it is nowhere. An opposition is organized but it is an organization, not of the democratic party but of three parties. It presents not one candidate, but three candidates for president. It comes up to fight its first, last and desperate battle with the republican party which is engaged in the effort and determination to elect a president by a majority of votes; and this hybrid party comes up and puts into the hands of the electors, ballots for scattering the votes, not concentrating them; to defeat the election of a president of the United States because they cannot agree whom they would elect. Strange confusion of the times, this! Have you ever studied the present creed of the opposition? I will endeavor to recite it for you:

"I believe in intervening in the territories of the United States for slavery; I also fully believe in non-intervening in the territories of the United States for slavery, and I further believe that it is not right either to intervene or to not intervene. Each of these three articles of faith is essential and of saving health to the nation. He that is faithful must believe them all, and he that is faithful must believe one and reject the other two. I believe in Stephen A. Douglas as a candidate for the presidency of the United States, and

I pledge myself to vote for him to the exclusion of everybody else. I also believe in John C. Breckinridge, and I pledge myself to vote for him to the exclusion of Stephen A. Douglas and of everybody else; and I also equally and implicitly believe in John Bell as a candidate for president of the United States, and I pledge myself to vote for him to the exclusion of Douglas and Breckinridge. I promise faithfully to vote for them all, and to vote, at the same time, against either one, except the one not designated as my choice."

Now here is the trinity in unity and unity in trinity, of the political church, just now come to us by the light of a new revelation, and christened "Fusion." And this "Fusion" party, what is the motive to which it appeals? You may go with me into the streets to-night and follow the little giants, who go with their torch-lights and their flaunting banners of "Popular Sovereignty;" or you may go with the smaller and more select and modest band who go for Breckinridge and slavery; or you may follow the music of the clanging bells, and, strange to say, they will all bring you into one common chamber. When you get there you will hear only this emotion of the human heart appealed to, fear,—fear that if you elect a president of the United States according to the constitution and the laws to-morrow, you will wake up the next day and find that you have no country for him to preside over. Is that not a strange motive for an American patriot to appeal to? And in that same hall, amid the jargon of three discordant members of the fusion party, you will hear one argument, and that argument is, that so sure as you are so perverse as to cast your vote singly, lawfully, honestly, as you ought to do, for one candidate for the presidency, instead of scattering it among three candidates, so that no president may be elected, this Union shall come down over your heads, involving you and us in a common ruin.

Fellow citizens, it is time, high time, that we know whether this is a constitutional government under which we live. It is high time that we know, since the Union is threatened, who are its friends and who are its enemies. The republican party who propose in the old appointed constitutional way to choose a president, are every man of them loyal to the Union. The disloyalists, wherever they may be, are those who are opposed to the republican party and attempt to prevent the election of a president. I know that our good and esteemed neighbors—Heaven knows I have cause to

respect and esteem and honor and love them as I do, for such neighbors as even my democratic neighbors, no other man ever had—I know that they do not avow, nor do they mean to support or think they are supporting disunionists. But I tell them that he who proposes to lay hold of the pillars of the Union and bring it down into ruin, is a disunionist; that every man who quotes him, and uses his threats and his menaces as an argument against our exercise of our duty, is an abettor, unconscious though he may be, of disunion; and that when to-morrow's sun shall have set and the next morning's sun shall have risen upon the American people, rejoicing in the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency, those men who to-day sympathize with, uphold, support and excuse the disunionists, will have to make a sudden choice and choose whether, in the language of the senator from Georgia, they will go for treason and so make it respectable, or whether they will go with us for freedom, for the constitution, and for eternal Union.

THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.[1]

THE past was for the east—the future is for the west. Empire has culminated in the east, and is now passing to the west. The past was for slavery, which at one time was practically universal in the east. The future is for freedom, which, in the order of Providence, is to be universal in the west. The change from past eastern slavery to future western freedom is to be effected simply by bringing the mind of the nation to a just apprehension of what slavery is. Our fathers in the east understood it to be a question simply of trade. The Declaration of Independence and the constitution of the United States, announced on the other hand, that slavery is a question of human rights. While they left the regulation of that subject within the states to the states themselves, they did establish the principle that in the common territories of the United States and within the sphere of federal action, every man is a person, a man, a free man, who could neither hold another in slavery nor be held in bondage by any other man.

[1] Extract from a speech at Cleveland, Oct. 4, 1860.

SPEECHES

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

LETTER TO THE NEW YORK MEETING.[1]

WASHINGTON, January 28, 1854.

"The invitation to a meeting to be held in the city of New York, to protest against any repeal or violation of the Missouri compromise, with which you have honored me, has been received. My constant attendance here is required by the interest which the city of New York and the state of New York have in the great projects of a railroad to San Francisco, and the extension of our commerce to the islands and continents divided from us by the Pacific ocean, which are now being matured in committees to which I belong. Moreover the day designated for the meeting is one upon which the senate may be brought to a vote upon the bold and dangerous measure which has so justly excited the patriotic apprehensions of the citizens of the metropolis. I could not be safely absent from the capital under these circumstances, even if my attendance in New York would otherwise be proper.

"You have kindly asked me, in view of this inability, to give you such an expression of my 'sentiments as may help to arouse the north to the defense of its rights, and the south to maintenance of its plighted honor.' Permit me to say, in response to the appeal, that when the slavery laws of 1850 were under discussion in the senate, I regarded the ground then demanded to be conceded by the north as a vantage ground, which, when once yielded, would be retrieved with infinite difficulty afterward, if, indeed, it should not be absolutely irretrievable; and that, I, therefore, in my place as a representative here, said and did all that it was in my power to do and say, and all that I could now do and say, to 'help to rouse the north to the defense of its rights, and south to the maintenance of its honor.' When, afterward, eminent members of congress, who had been engaged in passing those laws, carried an appeal against those who had opposed them before the people in their primary assemblies, I declined to follow them then, and I have ever since refrained from all unnecessary discussions of the slave laws of 1850, and of matters pertaining to slavery, even here, as well as elsewhere, because I was unwilling to injure so just a cause by discussions which might seem to betray undue solicitude, if not a spirit of faction. We have only now arrived at a new stage in the trial of that appeal. For it is quite clear that if the slavery laws had not been passed in 1850, for the territories acquired from Mexico, there would have been no pretense for extending such slavery laws now, over the territories before acquired from Louisiana, and that if we had maintained our ground on the laws of freedom, which then protected New Mexico and Utah, we should not now have been attacked in our stronghold in Nebraska. It is equally evident, also, that Nebraska is not all that is to be saved or lost. If we are driven from this field, there will yet remain Oregon and Minnesota, and we who thought only so lately as 1849 of securing some portion at least of the shore of the gulf of Mexico and all of the Pacific coast to the institutions of freedom, will be, before 1859, brought to a doubtful struggle to prevent the extension of slavery to the shores of the great lakes, and thence westward to Puget's sound. I hope, gentlemen, that for one, I may be allowed to continue to the end that abstinence from popular agitation which I have heretofore practised, less from considerations of self-respect than from my confidence in the sagacity and virtue of the people I represent. Nevertheless, I beg you to be assured that, while declining to go into popular assemblies, as an agitator, I shall endeavor to do my duty here with as many true men as shall be found in a delegation, which, if all were firm and united in the maintenance of public right and justice, would be able to control the decision of this great question. But the measure of success and effect which shall crown our exertions must depend now, as heretofore, on the fidelity with which the people whom we represent shall adhere to the policy and principles which are the foundation of their own unrivaled prosperity and greatness.

"I am, gentlemen, with great respect and esteem, your obedient servant,

"WILLIAM H. SEWARD."

[1] See *ante* page 27.

SPEECHES

IN

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

NEBRASKA AND KANSAS.

FREEDOM AND PUBLIC FAITH.[1]

The United States of America, at the close of the revolution, rested southward on the St. Mary's, and westward on the Mississippi, and possessed a broad, unoccupied domain, circumscribed by those rivers, the Alleghany mountains, and the great northern lakes. The constitution anticipated a division of this domain into states, to be admitted as members of the Union, but it neither provided for nor foresaw any enlargement of the national boundaries. The people, engaged in reörganizing their governments, improving their social systems, and establishing relations of commerce and friendship with other nations, remained many years content within their apparently ample limits. But it was already known that the free navigation of the Mississippi would soon become an urgent public want.

France, although she had lost Canada, in chivalrous battle, on the Heights of Abraham, in 1763, nevertheless, still retained her ancient territories on the western bank of the Mississippi. She had also, just before the breaking out of her own fearful revolution, reäcquired, by a secret treaty, the possessions on the gulf of Mexico, which, in a recent war, had been wrested from her by Spain. Her

[1] Speech in the United States Senate, February 17, 1854.

first consul, among those brilliant achievements which proved him the first statesman, as well as the first captain of Europe, sagaciously sold the whole of these possessions to the United States, for a liberal sum, and thus replenished his treasury, while he saved from his enemies, and transferred to a friendly power, distant and vast regions which, for want of adequate naval force, he was unable to defend.

This purchase of Louisiana from France by the United States, involved a grave dispute concerning the western limits of that province; and that controversy, having remained open until 1819, was then adjusted by a treaty, in which they relinquished Texas to Spain, and accepted a cession of the early discovered and long inhabited provinces of East Florida and West Florida. The United States stipulated, in each of these cases, to admit the countries thus annexed into the Federal Union.

The acquisitions of Oregon, by discovery and occupation, of Texas, by voluntary annexation, and of New Mexico and California, including what is now called Utah, by war, completed the rapid course of enlargement, at the close of which our frontier has been fixed near the center of what was New Spain, on the Atlantic side of the continent, while on the west, as on the east, only an ocean separates us from the nations of the old world. It is not in my way now to speculate on the question, how long we are to rest on these advanced positions.

Slavery, before the revolution, existed in all the thirteen colonies, as it did also in nearly all the other European plantations in America. But it had been forced by British authority, for political and commercial ends, on the American people, against their own sagacious instincts of policy, and their strongest feelings of justice and humanity.

They had protested and remonstrated against the system earnestly, for forty years, and they ceased to protest and remonstrate against it only when they finally committed their entire cause of complaint to the arbitrament of arms. An earnest spirit of emancipation was abroad in the colonies at the close of the revolution, and all of them, except perhaps South Carolina and Georgia, anticipated, desired and designed an early removal of the system from the country. The suppression of the African slave trade, which was universally regarded as ancillary to that great measure, was, with much reluctance, postponed until 1808.

While there was no national power, and no claim or desire for national power, anywhere, to compel involuntary emancipation in the state where slavery existed, there was at the same time a very general desire and a strong purpose to prevent its introduction into new communities, yet to be formed, and into new states yet to be established. Mr. Jefferson proposed, as early as 1784, to exclude it from the national domain—which should be constituted by cessions from the states to the United States. He recommended and urged the measure as ancillary, also, to the ultimate policy of emancipation. There seems to have been at first no very deep jealousy between the emancipating and the non-emancipating states; and the policy of admitting new states was not disturbed by questions concerning slavery. Vermont, a non-slaveholding state, was admitted in 1793. Kentucky, a tramontane slaveholding community, having been detached from Virginia, was admitted, without being questioned, about the same time. So, also, Tennessee, which was a similar community separated from North Carolina, was admitted in 1796, with a stipulation that the ordinance which Mr. Jefferson had first proposed, and which had in the meantime been adopted for the territory northwest of the Ohio, should not be held to apply within her limits. The same course was adopted in organizing territorial governments for Mississippi and Alabama, slaveholding communities which had been detached from South Carolina and Georgia. All these states and territories were situated southwest of the Ohio river, all were more or less already peopled by slaveholders with their slaves; and to have excluded slavery within their limits would have been a national act, not of preventing the introduction of slavery, but of abolishing slavery. In short, the region southwest of the Ohio river presented a field in which the policy of preventing the introduction of slavery was impracticable. Our forefathers never attempted what was impracticable.

But the case was otherwise in that fair and broad region which stretched away from the banks of the Ohio, northward to the lakes, and westward to the Mississippi. It was yet free, or practically free, from the presence of slaves, and was nearly uninhabited, and quite unoccupied. There was then no Baltimore and Ohio railroad, no Erie railroad, no New York Central railroad, no Boston and Ogdensburgh railroad; there was no railroad through Canada; nor, indeed, any road around or across the mountains; no imperial Erie canal,

no Welland canal, no lockage around the rapids and the falls of the St. Lawrence, the Mohawk and the Niagara rivers, and no steam navigation on the lakes, or on the Hudson, or on the Mississippi. There, in that remote and secluded region, the prevention of the introduction of slavery was possible; and there our forefathers, who left no possible national good unattempted, did prevent it. It makes one's heart bound with joy and gratitude, and lift itself up with mingled pride and veneration, to read the history of that great transaction. Discarding the trite and common forms of expressing the national will, they did not merely "vote," or "resolve," or "enact," as on other occasions, but they "ORDAINED," in language marked at once with precision, amplification, solemnity and emphasis, that there "shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." And they further ORDAINED and declared that this law should be considered a COMPACT between the original states and the people and states of said territory, and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent. The ordinance was agreed to unanimously. Virginia, in reaffirming her cession of the territory, ratified it, and the first congress held under the constitution solemnly renewed and confirmed it.

In pursuance of this ordinance, the several territorial governments successively established in the northwest territory, were organized with a prohibition of the introduction of slavery, and in due time, though at successive periods, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, states erected within that territory, have come into the Union with constitutions in their hands forever prohibiting slavery and involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime. They are yet young; but, nevertheless, who has ever seen elsewhere such states as they are? There are gathered the young, the vigorous, the active, the enlightened sons of every state, the flower and choice of every state in this broad Union; and there the emigrant, for conscience sake, and for freedom's sake, from every land in Europe, from proud and all-conquering Britain, from heart-broken Ireland, from sunny Italy, from mercurial France, from spiritual Germany, from chivalrous Hungary, and from honest and brave old Sweden and Norway. Thence are already coming ample supplies of corn and wheat and wine for the manufacturers of the east, for the planters of the tropics, and even for the artisans and the armies

of Europe; and thence will continue to come in long succession, as they have already begun to come, statesmen and legislators for this continent.

Thus it appears, Mr. President, that it was the policy of our fathers, in regard to the original domain of the United States, to prevent the introduction of slavery, wherever it was practicable. This policy encountered greater difficulties when it came under consideration with a view to its establishment in regions not included within our original domain. While slavery had been actually abolished already, by some of the emancipating states, several of them, owing to a great change in the relative value of the productions of slave labor, had fallen off into the class of non-emancipating states; and now the whole family of states was divided and classified as slaveholding or slave states, and non-slaveholding or free states. A rivalry for political ascendency was soon developed; and besides the motives of interest and philanthropy which had before existed, there was now on each side a desire to increase, from among the candidates for admission into the Union, the number of states in their respective classes, and so their relative weight and influence in the federal councils.

The country which had been acquired from France was, in 1804, organized in two territories, one of which, including New Orleans as its capital, was called Orleans, and the other, having St. Louis for its chief town, was called Louisiana. In 1812, the territory of Orleans was admitted as a new state, under the name of Louisiana. It had been an old slaveholding colony of France, and the prevention of slavery within it would have been a simple act of abolition. At the same time, the territory of Louisiana, by authority of congress, took the name of Missouri; and, in 1819, the portion thereof which now constitutes the state of Arkansas was detached, and became a territory, under that name. In 1819, Missouri, which was then but thinly peopled, and had an inconsiderable number of slaves, applied for admission into the Union, and her application brought the question of extending the policy of the ordinance of 1787 to that state, and to other new states in the region acquired from France, to a direct issue. The house of representatives insisted on a prohibition against the further introduction of slavery in the state, as a condition of her admission. The senate disagreed with the house in that demand. The non-slaveholding states sustained the

house, and the slaveholding states sustained the senate. The difference was radical, and tended toward revolution.

One party maintained that the condition demanded was constitutional, the other that it was unconstitutional. The public mind became intensely excited, and painful apprehensions of disunion and civil war began to prevail in the country.

In this crisis, a majority of both houses agreed upon a plan for the adjustment of the controversy. By this plan, Maine, a non-slaveholding state, was to be admitted; Missouri was to be admitted without submitting to the condition before mentioned; and in all that part of the territory acquired from France, which was north of the line of 36° 30′ of north latitude, slavery was to be forever prohibited. Louisiana, which was a part of that territory, had been admitted as a slave state eight years before; and now, not only was Missouri to be admitted as a slave state, but Arkansas, which was south of that line, by strong implication, was also to be admitted as a slaveholding state. I need not indicate what were the equivalents which the respective parties were to receive in this arrangement, further than to say that the slaveholding states practically were to receive slaveholding states, the free states to receive a desert, a solitude, in which they might, if they could, plant the germs of future free states. This measure was adopted. It was a great national transaction—the first of a class of transactions which have since come to be thoroughly defined and well understood, under the name of compromises. My own opinions concerning them are well known, and are not in question here. According to the general understanding, they are marked by peculiar circumstances and features, viz.:

First, there is a division of opinion upon some vital national question between the two houses of congress, which division is irreconcilable, except by mutual concessions of interests and opinions, which the houses deem constitutional and just.

Secondly, they are rendered necessary by impending calamities, to result from the failure of legislation, and to be no otherwise averted than by such mutual concessions, or sacrifices.

Thirdly, such concessions are mutual and equal, or are accepted as such, and so become conditions of the mutual arrangement.

Fourthly, by this mutual exchange of conditions, the transaction takes on the nature and character of a contract, compact, or treaty, between the parties represented; and so, according to well-settled

principles of morality and public law, the statute which embodies it is understood, by those who uphold this system of legislation, to be irrevocable and irrepealable, except by the mutual consent of both, or of all the parties concerned. Not indeed, that it is absolutely irrepealable, but that it cannot be repealed without a violation of honor, justice, and good faith, which it is presumed will not be committed.

Such was the compromise of 1820. Missouri came into the Union immediately as a slaveholding state, and Arkansas came in as a slaveholding state, sixteen years afterward. Nebraska, the part of the territory reserved exclusively for free territories and free states, has remained a wilderness ever since. And now it is proposed here to abrogate, not, indeed, the whole compromise, but only that part of it which saved Nebraska as a free territory, to be afterward divided into non-slaveholding states, which should be admitted into the Union. And this is proposed, notwithstanding a universal acquiescence in the compromise, by both parties, for thirty years, and its confirmation, over and over again, by many acts of successive congresses, and notwithstanding that the slaveholding states have peaceably enjoyed, ever since it was made, all their equivalents, while, owing to circumstances which will hereafter appear, the non-slaveholding states have not practically enjoyed those guarantied to them.

This is the question now before the senate of the United States of America.

It is a question of transcendent importance The proviso of 1820, to be abrogated in Nebraska, is the ordinance of the continental congress of 1787, extended over a new part of the national domain acquired under our present constitution. It is rendered venerable by its antiquity, and sacred by the memory of that congress, which in surrendering its trust, after establishing the ordinance, enjoined it upon posterity, always to remember that the cause of the United States was the cause of human nature. The question involves an issue of public faith, and national morality and honor. It will be a sad day for this republic, when such a question shall be deemed unworthy of grave discussion, and shall fail to excite intense interest. Even if it were certain that the inhibition of slavery in the region concerned was unnecessary, and if the question were thus reduced to a mere abstraction, yet even that abstraction would

involve the testimony of the United States on the expediency, wisdom, morality, and justice, of the system of human bondage, with which this and other portions of the world have been so long afflicted; and it will be a melancholy day for the republic and for mankind, when her decision on even such an abstraction shall command no respect, and inspire no hope into the hearts of the oppressed.

But it is no such abstraction. It was no unnecessary dispute, no mere contest of blind passion, that brought that compromise into being. Slavery and freedom were active antagonists, then seeking for ascendency in this Union. Both slavery and freedom are more vigorous, active, and self-aggrandizing now, than they were then, or ever were before or since that period. The contest between them has been only protracted, not decided. It will be a great feature in our national hereafter. So the question of adhering to or abrogating this compromise is no unmeaning issue, and no contest of mere blind passion now.

To adhere, is to secure the occupation by freemen, with free labor, of a region in the very center of the continent, capable of sustaining, and in that event destined, though it may be only after a far-distant period, to sustain ten, twenty, thirty, forty millions of people and their successive generations forever!

To abrogate, is to resign all that vast region to chances which mortal vision cannot fully foresee; perhaps to the sovereignty of such stinted and short-lived communities as those of which Mexico and South America and the West India islands present us with examples; perhaps to convert that region into a scene of long and desolating conflicts between not merely races, but castes, to end, like a similar conflict in Egypt, in a convulsive exodus of the oppressed people, despoiling their superiors; perhaps, like one not dissimilar in Spain, in the forcible expulsion of the inferior race, exhausting the state by the sudden and complete suppression of a great resource of national wealth and labor; perhaps in the disastrous expulsion, even of the superior race itself, by a people too suddenly raised from slavery to liberty, as in St. Domingo. To adhere is to secure forever the presence here, after some lapse of time, of two, four, ten, twenty, or more senators, and of representatives in larger proportions, to uphold the policy and interests of the non-slaveholding states, and balance that ever-increasing representation of slaveholding states, which past experience, and the decay of the Spanish-

American states, admonish us has only just begun; to save what the non-slaveholding states have in mints, navy-yards, the military academy and fortifications, to balance against the capital and federal institutions in the slaveholding states; to save against any danger from adverse or hostile policy, the culture, the manufactures, and the commerce, as well as the just influence and weight of the national principles and sentiments of the slaveholding states. To adhere is to save to the non-slaveholding states, as well as to the slaveholding states, always, and in every event, a right of way and free communication across the continent, to and with the states on the Pacific coasts, and with the rising states on the islands in the South sea, and with all the eastern nations on the vast continent of Asia.

To abrogate, on the contrary, is to commit all these precious interests to the chances and hazards of embarrassment and injury by legislation, under the influence of social, political and commercial jealousy and rivalry; and in the event of the secession of the slaveholding states, which is so often threatened in their name, but I thank God without their authority, to give to a servile population a La Vendee at the very sources of the Mississippi, and in the very recesses of the Rocky mountains.

Nor is this last a contingency against which a statesman, when engaged in giving a constitution for such a territory so situated, must veil his eyes. It is a statesman's province and duty to look before as well as after. I know, indeed, the present loyalty of the American people north and south and east and west. I know that it is a sentiment stronger than any sectional interest or ambition, and stronger than even the love of equality in the non-slaveholding states, and stronger, I doubt not, than the love of slavery in the slaveholding states. But I do not know, and no mortal sagacity does know, the seductions of interest and ambition, and the influences of passion, which are yet to be matured in every region. I know this, however, that this Union is safe now, and that it will be safe so long as impartial political equality shall constitute the basis of society, as it has heretofore done, in even half of these states, and they shall thus maintain a just equilibrium against the slaveholding states. But I am well assured, also, on the other hand, that if ever the slaveholding states shall multiply themselves and extend their sphere so that they could, without association with the non-slaveholding

states, constitute of themselves a commercial republic, from that day their rule, through the executive, judicial and legislative powers of this government, will be such as will be hard for the non-slaveholding states to bear; and their pride and ambition, since they are congregations of men and are moved by human passions, will consent to no Union in which they shall not so rule.

The slaveholding states already possess the mouths of the Mississippi, and their territory reaches far northward along its banks on one side to the Ohio, and on the other even to the confluence of the Missouri. They stretch their dominion now from the banks of the Delaware, quite around bay, headland and promontory to the Rio Grande. They will not stop, although they now think they may, on the summit of the Sierra Nevada; nay, their armed pioneers are already in Sonora, and their eyes are already fixed, never to be taken off, on the island of Cuba, the queen of the Antilles. If we of the non-slaveholding states surrender to them now the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains and the very sources of the Mississippi, what territory will be secure, what territory can be secured hereafter, for the creation and organization of free states within our ocean-bound domain? What territories on this continent will remain unappropriated and unoccupied for us to annex? What territories, even if we are able to buy or conquer them from Great Britain or Russia, will the slaveholding states suffer, much less aid us to annex, to restore the equilibrium which, by this unnecessary measure, we shall have so unwisely, so hurriedly, so suicidally subverted?

Nor am I to be told that only a few slaves will enter into this vast region. One slaveholder in a new territory, with access to the executive ear at Washington, exercises more political influence than five hundred freemen. It is not necessary that all or a majority of the citizens of a state shall be slaveholders to constitute a slaveholding state. Delaware has only two thousand slaves against ninety-one thousand freemen; and yet Delaware is a slaveholding state. The proportion is not substantially different in Maryland and in Missouri; and yet they are slaveholding states. These, sir, are the stakes in this legislative game, in which I lament to see, that while the representatives of the slaveholding states are unanimously and earnestly playing to win, so many of the representatives of the non-slaveholding states are, with even greater zeal and diligence, playing to lose.

The committee who have recommended these twin bills for the organization of the territories of Nebraska and Kansas, hold the affirmative in the argument upon their passage.

What is the case they present to the senate and the country?

They have submitted a report, but that report, brought in before they had introduced or even conceived this bold and daring measure of abrogating the Missouri compromise, directs all its arguments against it.

The committee say in their report:

"Such being the character of the controversy, in respect to the territory acquired from Mexico, a similar question has arisen in regard to the right to hold slaves in the proposed territory of Nebraska, when the Indian laws shall be withdrawn, and the country thrown open to emigration and settlement. By the eighth section of 'An act to authorize the people of the Missouri territory to form a constitution and state government, and for the admission of such state into the Union on an equal footing with the original states, and to prohibit slavery in certain territories,' approved March 6, 1820, it was provided: 'That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the state contemplated by this act, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be and is hereby forever prohibited: *Provided, always*, that any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed, in any state or territory of the United States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid.'

"Under this section, as in the case of the Mexican law in New Mexico and Utah, it is a disputed point whether slavery is prohibited in the Nebraska country by *valid* enactment. The decision of this question involves the constitutional power of congress to pass laws prescribing and regulating the domestic institutions of the various territories of the Union. In the opinion of those eminent statesmen who hold that congress is invested with no rightful authority to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories, the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri is null and void: while the prevailing sentiment in large portions of the Union sustains the doctrine that the constitution of the United States secures to every citizen an inalienable right to move into any of the territories with his property, of whatever kind and description, and to hold and enjoy the same under the sanction of the law. Your committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife and the fearful struggle of 1850. As congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matters in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws, or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the constitution, and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the territories, so your committee are not prepared now to recommend a departure

from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, either by affirming or repealing the eighth section of the Missouri act, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute."

This report gives us the deliberate judgment of the committee on two important points. First, that the compromise of 1850 did not, by its letter or by its spirit, repeal or render necessary, or even propose the abrogation of the Missouri compromise; and, secondly, that the Missouri compromise ought not now to be abrogated. And now, sir, what do we next hear from this committee? First, two similar and kindred bills, actually abrogating the Missouri compromise, which in their report they had told us ought not to be abrogated at all. Secondly, these bills declare on their face in substance that that compromise was already abrogated by the spirit of that very compromise of 1850, which, in their report they had just shown us, left the compromise of 1820 absolutely unaffected and unimpaired. Thirdly, the committee favor us, by their chairman, with an oral explanation that the amended bills abrogating the Missouri compromise are identical with their previous bill, which did not abrogate it, and are only made to differ in phraseology, to the end that the provisions contained in their previous, and now discarded bill, shall be absolutely clear and certain.

I entertain great respect for the committee itself, but I must take leave to say that the inconsistencies and self-contradictions contained in the papers it has given us, have destroyed all claims, on the part of those documents, to respect, here or elsewhere.

The recital of the effect of the compromise of 1850, upon the compromise of 1820, as finally revised, corrected, and amended, here in the face of the senate, means after all substantially what that recital meant as it stood before it was perfected, or else it means nothing tangible or worthy of consideration at all. What if the spirit, or even the letter, of the compromise laws of 1850 did conflict with the compromise of 1820? The compromise of 1820 was, by its very nature, a compromise irrepealable and unchangeable, without a violation of honor, justice, and good faith. The compromise of 1850, if it impaired the previous compromise to the extent of the loss to free labor of one acre of the territory of Nebraska, was either absolutely void, or ought, in all subsequent legislation, to be deemed and held void.

What if the spirit or the letter of the compromise was a violation of the compromise of 1820? Then, inasmuch as the compromise of 1820 was inviolable, the attempted violation of it shows that the so-called compromise of 1850 was to that extent not a compromise at all, but a factitious, spurious, and pretended compromise. What if the letter or spirit of the compromise of 1850 did supersede or impair, or in any way, in any degree, conflict with the compromise of 1820? Then that is a reason for abrogating, not the irrepealable and inviolable compromise of 1820, but the spurious and pretended compromise of 1850.

Why is this reason for the proposed abrogation of the compromise of 1820 assigned in these bills at all? It is unnecessary. The assignment of a reason adds nothing to the force or weight of the abrogation itself. Either the fact alleged as a reason is *true* or it is *not* true. If it be untrue, your asserting it here will not make it true. If it be true, it is apparent in the text of the law of 1850, without the aid of legislative exposition now. It is unusual. It is unparliamentary. The language of the lawgiver, whether the sovereign be democratic, republican, or despotic, is always the same. It is mandatory, imperative. If the lawgiver explains at all in a statute the reason for it, the reason is that it is his pleasure—*sic volo, sic jubeo.* Look at the compromise of 1820. Does it plead an excuse for its commands? Look at the compromise of 1850, drawn by the master-hand of our American Chatham. Does that bespeak your favor by a quibbling or shuffling apology? Look at your own, now rejected, first Nebraska bill, which, by conclusive implication, saved the effect of the Missouri compromise. Look at any other bill ever reported by the committee on territories. Look at any other bill now on your calendar. Examine all the laws on your statute books. Do you find any one bill or statute which ever came bowing, stooping, and wriggling into the senate, pleading an excuse for its clear and explicit declaration of the sovereign and irresistible will of the American people? The departure from this habit in this solitary case betrays self-distrust, and an attempt on the part of the bill to divert the public attention, to raise complex and immaterial issues, to perplex and bewilder and confound the people by whom this transaction is to be reviewed. Look again at the vacillation betrayed in the frequent changes of the structure of this apology. At first the recital told us that the eighth section

of the compromise act of 1820 was superseded by the principles of the compromise laws of 1850—as if any one had ever heard of a supersedeas of one local law by the mere *principles* of another local law, enacted for an altogether different region, thirty years afterward. On another day we were told, by an amendment of the recital, that the compromise of 1820 was not superseded by the compromise of 1850 at all, but was only "inconsistent with" it—as if a local act which was irrepealable was now to be abrogated, because it was inconsistent with a subsequent enactment, which had no application whatever within the region to which the first enactment was confined. On a third day the meaning of the recital was further and finally elucidated by an amendment, which declared that the first irrepealable act protecting Nebraska from slavery was now declared "inoperative and void," because it was inconsistent with the present purposes of congress not to legislate slavery into any territory or state, nor to exclude it therefrom.

But take this apology in whatever form it may be expressed, and test its logic by a simple process.

The law of 1820 secured free institutions in the regions acquired from France in 1803, by the wise and prudent foresight of the congress of the United States. The law of 1850, on the contrary, committed the choice between free and slave institutions in New Mexico and Utah—territories acquired from Mexico nearly fifty years afterward—to the interested cupidity or the caprice of their earliest and accidental occupants. Free institutions and slave institutions are equal, but the interested cupidity of the pioneer is a wiser arbiter, and his judgment a surer safeguard, than the collective wisdom of the American people and the most solemn and time-honored statute of the American congress. Therefore, let the law of freedom in the territory acquired from France be now annulled and abrogated, and let the fortunes and fate of freedom and slavery, in the region acquired from France, be, henceforward and forever, determined by the votes of some seven hundred camp followers around Fort Leavenworth, and the still smaller number of trappers, government school-masters, and mechanics, who attend the Indians in their seasons of rest from hunting in the passes of the Rocky mountains. Sir, this syllogism may satisfy you and other senators; but as for me, I must be content to adhere to the earlier system. *Stare super antiquas vias.*

There is yet another difficulty in this new theory. Let it be granted that, in order to carry out a new principle recently adopted in New Mexico, you can supplant a compromise in Nebraska, yet there is a maxim of public law which forbids you from supplanting that compromise, and establishing a new system *there*, until you first restore the parties in interest there to their *statu quo* before the compromise to be supplanted was established. First, then, remand Missouri and Arkansas back to the unsettled condition, in regard to slavery, which they held before the compromise of 1820 was enacted, and then we will hear you talk of rescinding that compromise. You cannot do this. You ought not to do it, if you could; and because you cannot and ought not to do it, you cannot, without violating law, justice, equity and honor, abrogate the guarantee of freedom in Nebraska.

There is still another and not less serious difficulty. You call the slavery laws of 1850 a compromise between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding states. For the purposes of this argument, let it be granted that they were such a compromise. It was nevertheless a compromise concerning slavery in the territories acquired from Mexico, and by the letter of the compromise it extended no further. Can you now, by an act which is not a compromise between the same parties, but a mere ordinary law, extend the force and obligation of the principles of that compromise of 1850 into regions not only excluded from it, but absolutely protected from your intervention there by a solemn compromise of thirty years' duration, and invested with a sanctity scarcely inferior to that which hallows the constitution itself?

Can the compromise of 1850, by a mere ordinary act of legislation, be extended beyond the plain, known, fixed intent and understanding of the parties at the time that contract was made, and yet be binding on the parties to it, not merely legally, but in honor and conscience? Can you abrogate a compromise by passing any law of less dignity than a compromise? If so, of what value is any one or the whole of the compromises? Thus you see that these bills violate both of the compromises—not more that of 1820 than that of 1850.

Will you maintain in argument that it was understood by the parties interested throughout the country, or by either of them, or by any representative of either, in either house of congress, that the

principle then established should extend byond the limits of the territories acquired from Mexico, into the territories acquired nearly fifty years before, from France, and then reposing under the guaranty of the compromise of 1820? I know not how senators may *vote*, but I do know what they will *say*. I appeal to the honorable senator from Michigan [Mr. CASS], than whom none performed a more distinguished part in establishing the compromise of 1850, whether he so intended or understood. I appeal to the honorable and candid senator, the senior representative from Tennessee [Mr. BELL], who performed a distinguished part also. Did he so understand the compromise of 1850? He is silent. I appeal to the gallant senator from Illinois [Mr. SHIELDS]? He, too, is silent. I now throw my gauntlet at the feet of every senator now here, who was in the senate in 1850, and challenge him to say that he then knew, or thought, or dreamed, that, by enacting the compromise of 1850, he was directly or indirectly abrogating, or in any degree impairing, the Missouri compromise? No one takes it up. I appeal to that very distinguished—nay, sir, that expression falls short of his eminence—that illustrious man, the senator from Missouri [Mr. BENTON], who led the opposition here to the compromise of 1850. Did he understand that that compromise in any way overreached or impaired the compromise of 1820? Sir, that distinguished person, while opposing the combination of the several laws on the subject of California and the territories, and slavery, together, in one bill, so as to constitute a compromise, nevertheless voted for each one of those bills, severally; and in that way, and that way only, they were passed. Had he known or understood that any one of them overreached and impaired the Missouri compromise, we all know he would have perished before he would have given it his support.

If it were not irreverent, I would dare to call up the author of both of the compromises in question, from his honored, though yet scarcely grass-covered grave, and challenge any advocate of this measure to confront that imperious shade, and say that, in making the compromise of 1850, Henry Clay intended or dreamed that he was subverting or preparing the way for a subversion of his greater work of 1820. Sir, if that eagle spirit is yet lingering here over the scene of its mortal labors, and watching over the welfare of the republic it loved so well, it is now moved with more than human

indignation against those who are perverting its last great public act from its legitimate uses, not merely to subvert the column, but to wrench from its very bed the base of the column that perpetuates its fame.

And that other proud and dominating senator, who, sacrificing himself, gave the aid without which the compromise of 1850 could not have been established—the statesman of New England and the orator of America—who dare assert here where his memory is yet fresh, though his unfettered spirit may be wandering in spheres far hence, that he intended to abrogate, or dreamed that by virtue of or in consequence of that transaction, the Missouri compromise would or could ever be abrogated? The portion of the Missouri compromise you propose to abrogate, is the ordinance of 1787 extended to Nebraska. Hear what Daniel Webster said of that ordinance itself in 1830, in this very place, in reply to one who had undervalued it and its author:

"I spoke, sir, of the ordinance of 1787, which prohibits slavery, in all future time, northwest of the Ohio, as a measure of great wisdom and forethought, and one which has been attended with highly beneficial and permanent consequences."

And now hear what he said here, when advocating the compromise of 1850:

"I now say, sir, as the proposition upon which I stand this day, and upon the truth and firmness of which I intend to act until it is overthrown, that there is not at this moment in the United States, or any territory of the United States, one single foot of land, the character of which, in regard to its being free territory or slave territory, is not fixed by some law, and some IRREPEALABLE law, beyond the power of the action of this government."

What *irrepealable* law, or what law of any kind, fixed the character of Nebraska as free or slave territory, except the Missouri compromise act?

And now hear what Daniel Webster said when vindicating the compromise of 1850, at Buffalo, in 1851:

"My opinion remains unchanged, that it was not within the original scope or design of the constitution to admit new states out of foreign territory; and for one, whatever may be said at the Syracuse convention or any other assemblage of insane persons, I never would consent, and never have consented, that there should be one foot of slave territory beyond what the old thirteen states had at the time of the formation of the Union! Never! Never!

"The man cannot show his face to me and say he can prove that I ever departed from that doctrine. He would sneak away and slink away, or hire a mercenary press to cry out, What an apostate from liberty Daniel Webster has become! But he knows himself to be a hypocrite and a falsifier."

That compromise was forced upon the slaveholding states and upon the non-slaveholding states as a mutual exchange of equivalents. The equivalents were accurately defined and carefully scrutinized and weighed by the respective parties through a period of eight months. The equivalents offered to the non-slaveholding states were: First, the admission of California; second, the abolition of the public slave trade in the District of Columbia. These, and these only, were the boons offered to them, and the only sacrifices which the slaveholding states were required to make. The waiver of the Wilmot proviso in the incorporation of New Mexico and Utah, and a new fugitive slave law, were the only boons proposed to the slaveholding states, and the only sacrifices exacted of the non-slaveholding states. No other questions between them were agitated, except those which were involved in the gain or loss of more or less of free territory or of slave territory in the determination of the boundary between Texas and New Mexico, by a line that was at last arbitrarily made, expressly saving, even in *those territories*, to the respective parties, their respective shares of free soil and slave soil, according to the articles of annexation of the republic of Texas. Again: There were alleged to be five open, bleeding wounds in the federal system, and *no more*, which needed surgery, and to which the compromise of 1850 was to be a cataplasm. We all know what they were: California without a constitution; New Mexico in the grasp of military power; Utah neglected; the District of Columbia dishonored; and the rendition of fugitives denied. Nebraska was not even thought of in this catalogue of national ills. And now, sir, did the Nashville convention of secessionists understand that, besides the enumerated boons offered to the slaveholding states, they were to have also the obliteration of the Missouri compromise line of 1820? If they did, why did they reject and scorn and scout at the compromise of 1850? Did the legislatures and public assemblies of the non-slaveholding states, who made your table groan with their remonstrances, understand that Nebraska was an additional wound to be healed by the compromise of 1850? If they did, why did they omit to remonstrate against the healing of that, too, as well as of the other five, by the cataplasm, the application of which they resisted so long?

Again: Had it been then known that the Missouri compromise was to be abolished, directly or indirectly, by the compromise of 1850, what representative from a non-slaveholding state would, at

that day, have voted for it? Not one. What senator from a slaveholding state would not have voted for it? Not one. So entirely was it then unthought of that the new compromise was to repeal the Missouri compromise line of 36° 30′ in the region acquired from France, that one-half of that long debate was spent on propositions made by representatives from slaveholding states, to extend the line further on through the new territory we had acquired so recently from Mexico, until it should disappear in the waves of the Pacific ocean, so as to secure actual toleration of slavery in all of this new territory that should be south of that line; and these propositions were resisted strenuously and successfully to the last by the representatives of the non-slaveholding states, in order, if it were possible, to save the whole of those regions for the theatre of free labor.

I admit that these are only negative proofs, although they are pregnant with conviction. But here is one which is not only affirmative, but positive, and not more positive than conclusive.

In the fifth section of the Texas boundary bill, one of the acts constituting the compromise of 1850, are these words

"*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify anything contained in the third article of the second section of the joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, approved March 1, 1845, either as regards the number of states that may hereafter be formed out of the state of Texas or otherwise."

What was that third article of the second section of the joint resolution for annexing Texas? Here it is:

"New states of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said state of Texas, having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said state, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the federal constitution. And such states as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36° 30′ north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each state asking admission may desire. And in such state or states as shall be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited."

This article saved the compromise of 1820, in express terms, overcoming any implication of its abrogation, which might, by accident or otherwise, have crept into the compromise of 1850; and any inferences to that effect that might be drawn from any such circumstance as that of drawing the boundary line of Utah so as to tres-

pass on the territory of Nebraska, dwelt upon by the senator from Illinois.

The proposition to abrogate the Missouri compromise being thus stripped of the pretense that it is only a reiteration or a reaffirmation of a similar abrogation in the compromise of 1850, or a necessary consequence of that measure, stands before us now upon its own merits, whatever they may be.

But here the senator from Illinois challenges the assailants of these bills, on the ground that they all were opponents of the compromise of 1850, and even of that of 1820. Sir, it is not my purpose to answer in person to this challenge. The necessity, reasonableness, justice, and wisdom of those compromises, are not in question here now. My own opinions on them were, at a proper time, fully made known. I abide the judgment of my country and mankind upon them. For the present, I meet the committee who have brought this measure forward, on the field they themselves have chosen, and the controversy is reduced to two questions: 1st. Whether, by letter or spirit, the compromise of 1850 abrogated or involved a future abrogation of the compromise of 1820? 2d. Whether this abrogation can now be made consistently with honor, justice, and good faith? As to my right, or that of any other senator, to enter these lists, the credentials filed in the secretary's office settle that question. Mine bear a seal, as broad and as firmly fixed there as any other, by a people as wise, as free, and as great, as any one of all the thirty-one republics represented here.

But I will take leave to say, that an argument merely *ad personam*, seldom amounts to anything more than an argument *ad captandum*. A life of approval of compromises, and of devotion to them, only enhances the obligation faithfully to fulfill them. A life of disapprobation of the policy of compromises only renders one more earnest in exacting fulfillment of them, when good and cherished interests are secured by them.

Thus much for the report and the bills of the committee, and for the positions of the parties in this debate. A measure so bold, so unlooked-for, so startling, and yet so pregnant as this, should have some plea of necessity. Is there any such necessity? On the contrary, it is not necessary now, even if it be altogether wise, to establish territorial governments in Nebraska. Not less than eighteen tribes of Indians occupy that vast tract, fourteen of which,

I am informed, have been removed there by our own act, and invested with a fee simple to enjoy a secure and perpetual home, safe from the intrusion and the annoyance, and even from the *presence* of the white man, and under the paternal care of the government, and with the instruction of its teachers and mechanics, to acquire the arts of civilization and the habits of social life. I will not say that this was done to prevent that territory, because denied to slavery, from being occupied by free white men, and cultivated with free white labor; but I will say, that this removal of the Indians there, under such guaranties, has had that effect. The territory cannot be occupied now, any more than heretofore, by savages and white men, with or without slaves, together. Our experience and our Indian policy alike remove all dispute from this point. Either these preserved ranges must still remain to the Indians hereafter, or the Indians, whatever temporary resistance against removal they may make, must retire.

Where shall they go? Will you bring them back again across the Mississippi? There is no room for Indians here. Will you send them northward, beyond your territory of Nebraska, toward the British border? That is already occupied by Indians; there is no room there. Will you turn them loose upon Texas and New Mexico? There is no room there.

Will you drive them over the Rocky mountains? They will meet a tide of immigration there flowing into California from Europe and from Asia. Whither, then, shall they, the dispossessed, unpitied heirs of this vast continent, go? The answer is, *nowhere.* If they remain in Nebraska, of what use are your charters? Of what harm is the Missouri compromise in Nebraska, in that case? Whom doth it oppress? No one.

Who, indeed, demands territorial organization in Nebraska at all. The Indians? No. It is to them the consummation of a long apprehended doom. Practically, no one demands it. I am told that the whole white population, scattered here and there throughout those broad regions, exceeding in extent the whole of the inhabited part of the United States at the time of the revolution, is less than fifteen hundred, and that these are chiefly trappers, missionaries, and a few mechanics and agents employed by the government, in connection with the administration of Indian affairs, and other persons temporarily drawn around the post of Fort Leavenworth. It

is clear, then, that this abrogation of the Missouri compromise is not necessary for the purpose of establishing territorial governments in Nebraska, but that, on the contrary, these bills, establishing such governments, are only a vehicle for carrying, or a pretext for carrying, that act of abrogation.

It is alleged that the non-slaveholding states have forfeited their rights in Nebraska, under the Missouri compromise, by first breaking that compromise themselves. The argument is, that the Missouri compromise line of 36° 30′, in the region acquired from France, although confined to that region, which was our westernmost possession, was, nevertheless, understood as intended to be prospectively applied also to the territory reaching thence westward to the Pacific ocean, which we should afterward acquire from Mexico; and that when afterward, having acquired these territories, including California, New Mexico, and Utah, we were engaged in 1848 in extending governments over them, the free states refused to extend that line, on a proposition to that effect made by the honorable senator from Illinois.

It need only be stated, in refutation of this argument, that the Missouri compromise law, like any other statute, was limited by the extent of the subject of which it treated. This subject was the territory of Louisiana, acquired from France, whether the same were more or less, then in our lawful and peaceful possession. The length of the line of 36° 30′ established by the Missouri compromise, was the distance between the parallels of longitude which were the borders of that possession. Young America—I mean aggrandizing, conquering America—had not yet been born; nor was the statesman then in being who dreamed that, within thirty years afterward, we should have pushed our adventurous way not only across the Rocky mountains, but also across the snowy mountains. Nor did any one then imagine, that, even if we should have done so within the period I have named, we were then prospectively carving up and dividing, not only the mountain passes, but the Mexican empire on the Pacific coast, between freedom and slavery. If such a proposition had been made then, and persisted in, we know enough of the temper of 1820 to know this, viz.: that Missouri and Arkansas would have stood outside of the Union until even this portentous day.

The time, for aught I know, may not be thirty years distant, when the convulsions of the Celestial empire and the decline of British

sway in India will have opened our way into the regions beyond the Pacific ocean. I desire to know now, and be fully certified, of the geographical extent of the laws we are now passing, so that there may be no such mistake hereafter as that now complained of here. We are now confiding to territorial legislatures the power to legislate on slavery. Are the territories of Nebraska and Kansas alone within the purview of these acts? Or do they reach to the Pacific coast, and embrace also Oregon and Washington? Do they stop there, or do they take in China, and India, and Afghanistan, even to the gigantic base of the Himalaya mountains? Do they stop there, or, on the contrary, do they encircle the earth, and, meeting us again on the Atlantic coast, embrace the islands of Iceland and Greenland, and exhaust themselves on the barren coasts of Greenland and Labrador?

If the Missouri compromise neither is in its spirit nor by its letter extended to the line of 36° 30′ beyond the confines of Louisiana, or beyond the then confines of the United States—for the terms are equivalent—then it was no violation of the Missouri compromise in 1848 to refuse to extend it to the subsequently acquired possessions of Texas, New Mexico, and California.

But suppose we did refuse to extend it; how did that refusal work a forfeiture of our vested rights under it? I desire to know that.

Again: If this forfeiture of Nebraska occurred in 1848, as the senator charges, how does it happen that he not only failed in 1850, when the parties were in court here, adjusting their mutual claims, to demand judgment against the free states, but, on the contrary, even urged that the same old Missouri compromise line, yet held valid and sacred, should be extended through to the Pacific ocean?

I come now to the chief ground of the defense of this extraordinary measure, which is, that it abolishes a geographical line of division between the proper fields of free labor and slave labor, and refers the claim between them to the people of the territories. Even if this great change of policy was actually wise and necessary, I have shown that it is not necessary to make it now, in regard to the territory of Nebraska. If it would be just elsewhere, it would be unjust in regard to Nebraska, simply because, for ample and adequate equivalents, fully received, you have contracted in effect not to abolish that line there.

But why is this change of policy wise or necessary? It must be because either that the extension of slavery is no evil, or that you have not the power to prevent it at all, or because the maintenance of a geographical line is no longer practicable.

I know that the opinion is sometimes advanced, here and elsewhere, that the extension of slavery, abstractly considered, is not an evil; but our laws prohibiting the African slave trade are still standing on the statute book, and express the contrary judgment of the American congress and of the American people. I pass on, therefore, from that point.

I do not like, more than others, a geographical line between freedom and slavery. But it is because I would have, if it were possible, all our territory free. Since that cannot be, a line of division is indispensable; and any line is a geographical line.

The honorable and very acute senator from North Carolina (Mr. BADGER) has wooed us most persuasively to waive our objection to the new principle, as it is called, of non-intervention, by assuring us that the slaveholder can only use slave labor where the soils and climates favor the culture of tobacco, cotton, rice and sugar. To which I reply: None of these find congenial soils and climates at the sources of the Mississippi, or in the valley of the Rocky mountains. Why, then, does he want to remove the inhibition there?

But again: That senator reproduces a pleasing fiction of the character of slavery from the Jewish history, and asks: Why not allow the *modern patriarchs* to go into new regions with their slaves, as their ancient prototypes did, to make them more comfortable and happy? And he tells us, at the same time, that this indulgence will not increase the number of slaves. I reply by asking first, Whether slavery has gained or lost strength by the diffusion of it over a larger surface than it formerly covered? Will the senator answer that? Secondly, I admire the simplicity of the patriarchal times. But they, nevertheless, exhibited some peculiar institutions quite incongruous with modern republicanism, not to say Christianity, namely, that of a latitude of construction of the marriage contract, which has been carried by one class of so-called patriarchs into Utah. Certainly, no one would desire to extend that peculiar institution into Nebraska. Thirdly, slaveholders have also a peculiar institution, which makes them *political* patriarchs. They reckon five of their slaves as equal to three freemen in forming the basis of

federal representation. If these patriarchs insist upon carrying their institutions into new regions, north of 36° 30′, I respectfully submit that they ought to resume the modesty of their Jewish predecessors, and relinquish this political feature of the system they thus seek to extend. Will they do that?

Some senators have revived the argument that the Missouri compromise was unconstitutional. But it is one of the peculiarities of compromises, that constitutional objections, like all others, are buried under them by those who make and ratify them, for the obvious reason that the parties at once waive them, and receive equivalents. Certainly, the slaveholding states, which waived their constitutional objections against the compromise of 1820, and accepted equivalents therefor, cannot be allowed to revive and offer them now as a reason for refusing to the non-slaveholding states their rights under that compromise, without first restoring the equivalents which they received on condition of surrendering their constitutional objections.

For argument's sake, however, let this reply be waived, and let us look at this constitutional objection. You say that the exclusion of slavery by the Missouri compromise reaches through and beyond the existence of the region organized as a territory, and prohibits slavery FOREVER even in the states to be organized out of such territory, while, on the contrary, the states, when admitted, will be sovereign, and must have exclusive jurisdiction over slavery for themselves. Let this, too, be granted. But congress, according to the constitution, "may admit new states." If congress may admit, then congress may also refuse to admit—that is to say, may reject new states. The greater includes the less; therefore, congress may admit, on condition that the states shall exclude slavery. If such a condition should be accepted, would it not be binding?

It is by no means necessary, on this occasion to follow the argument further, to the question, whether such a condition is in conflict with the constitutional provision, that the new states received shall be admitted on an equal footing with the original states, because, in this case, and at present, the question relates not to the admission of a *state*, but to the organization of a territory, and the exclusion of slavery within the territory while its *status* as a territory shall continue, and no further. Congress have power to exclude slavery in territories, if they have any power to create, control or govern territories at all, for this simple reason: that, find the authority of

congress over the territories wherever you may, there you find no exception from that general authority in favor of slavery. If congress has no authority over slavery in the territories, it has none in the District of Columbia. If, then, you abolish a law of freedom in Nebraska, in order to establish a new policy of abnegation, then true consistency requires that you shall also abolish the slavery laws in the District of Columbia, and submit the question of the toleration of slavery within the district to its inhabitants.

If you reply, that the District of Columbia has no local or territorial legislature, then I rejoin, so also has not Nebraska, and so also has not Kansas. You are calling a territorial legislature into existence in Nebraska, and another in Kansas, to assume the jurisdiction on the subject of slavery, which you renounce. Then consistency demands that you call into existence a territorial legislature in the District of Columbia, to assume the jurisdiction here, which you must also renounce. Will you do this? We shall see.

To come closer to the question: What is this principle of abnegating national authority, on the subject of slavery, in favor of the people? Do you abnegate all authority whatever in the territories? Not at all; you abnegate only authority over slavery there. Do you abnegate even that? No; you do not, and you cannot. In the very act of abnegating you legislate, and enact that the states to be hereafter organized shall come in, whether slave or free, as their inhabitants shall choose. Is not this legislating not only on the subject of slavery in the territories, but on the subject of slavery in the future states? In the very act of abnegating, you call into being a legislature which shall resume the authority which you are renouncing. You not only exercise authority in that act, but you exercise authority over slavery when you confer on the territorial legislature the power to act upon that subject. More than this: In the very act of calling that territorial legislature into existence, you exercise authority in prescribing who may elect and who may be elected. You even reserve to yourselves a veto upon every act that they can pass as a legislative body, not only on all other subjects, but even on the subject of slavery itself. Nor can you relinquish that veto; for it is absurd to say that you can create an agent, and depute to him the legislative authority of the United States, which agent you cannot at your own pleasure remove, and whose acts you cannot at your own pleasure disavow and repudiate. The territorial legislature is

your agent. Its acts are your own. Such is the principle that is to supplant the ancient policy—a principle full of absurdities and contradictions.

Again: You claim that this policy of abnegation is based upon a democratic principle. A democratic principle is a principle opposed to some other that is despotic or aristocratic. You claim and exercise the power to institute and maintain government in the territories. Is this comprehensive power aristocratic or despotic? If it be not, how is the partial power aristocratic or despotic? You retain authority to appoint governors, without whose consent no laws can be made on any subject, and judges, without whose consideration no laws can be executed, and you retain the power to change them at pleasure. Are these powers, also, aristocratic or despotic? If they are not, then the exercise of legislative power by yourselves is not. If they are, then why not renounce them also? No, no. This is a far-fetched excuse. Democracy is a simple, uniform, logical system, not a system of arbitrary, contradictory, and conflicting principles!

But you must, nevertheless, renounce national authority over slavery in the territories, while you retain all other powers. What is this but a mere evasion of solemn responsibilities? The general authority of congress over the territories is one wisely confided to the national legislature, to save young and growing communities from the dangers which beset them in their state of pupilage, and to prevent them from adopting any policy that shall be at war with their own lasting interests, or with the general welfare of the whole republic. The authority over the subject of slavery is that which ought to be renounced last of all, in favor of territorial legislatures, because, from the very circumstances of the territories, those legislatures are likely to yield too readily to ephemeral influences, and interested offers of favor and patronage. They see neither the great future of the territories, nor the comprehensive and ultimate interests of the whole republic, as clearly as you see them, or ought to see them.

I have heard sectional excuses given for supporting this measure. I have heard senators from the slaveholding states say that they ought not to be expected to stand by the non-slaveholding states, when they refuse to stand by themselves; that they ought not to be expected to refuse the boon offered to the slaveholding states, since

it is offered by the non-slaveholding states themselves. I not only confess the plausibility of these excuses, but I feel the justice of the reproach which they imply against the non-slaveholding states, as far as the assumption is true. Nevertheless, senators from the slaveholding states must consider well whether that assumption is, in any considerable degree, founded in fact. If one or more senators from the north decline to stand by the non-slaveholding states, or offer a boon in their name, others from that region do, nevertheless, stand firmly on their rights, and protest against the giving or the acceptance of the boon. It has been said that the north does not speak out, so as to enable you to decide between the conflicting voices of her representatives. Are you quite sure you have given her timely notice? Have you not, on the contrary, hurried this measure forward, to anticipate her awaking from the slumber of conscious security into which she has been lulled by your last compromise! Have you not heard already the quick, sharp protest of the legislature of the smallest of the non-slaveholding states, Rhode Island? Have you not already heard the deep-toned and earnest protest of the greatest of those states, New York? Have you not already heard remonstrances from the metropolis, and from the rural districts? Do you doubt that this is only the rising of the agitation that you profess to believe is at rest forever? Do you forget that, in all such transactions as these, the people have a reserved right to review the acts of their representatives, and a right to demand a reconsideration; that there is in our legislative practice a form of RE-ENACTMENT, as well as an act of *repeal;* and that there is in our political system provision not only for *abrogation*, but for RESTORATION also? And when the process of repeal has begun, how many and what laws will be open to repeal, equally with the Missouri compromise? There will be this act, the fugitive slave laws, the articles of Texas annexation, the territorial laws of New Mexico and Utah, the slavery laws in the District of Columbia.

Senators from the slaveholding states, you are politicians as well as statesmen. Let me remind you, therefore, that political movements in this country, as in all others, have their times of action and reäction. The pendulum moved up the side of freedom in 1840, and swung back again in 1844 on the side of slavery, traversed the dial in 1848, and touched even the mark of the Wilmot proviso, and returned again in 1852, reaching even the height of the

Baltimore platform. Judge for yourselves whether it is yet ascending, and whether it will attain the height of the abrogation of the Missouri compromise. That is the mark you are fixing for it. For myself, I may claim to know something of the north. I see in the changes of the times only the vibrations of the needle, trembling on its pivot. I know that in due time it will settle; and when it shall have settled, it will point, as it must point forever, to the same constant polar star, that sheds down influences propitious to freedom as broadly as it pours forth its mellow but invigorating light.

I have nothing to do, here or elsewhere, with personal or party motives. But I come to consider the motive which is publicly assigned for this transaction. It is a desire to secure permanent peace and harmony on the subject of slavery, by removing all occasion for its future agitation in the federal legislature. Was there not peace already here? Was there not harmony as perfect as is ever possible in the country, when this measure was moved in the senate a month ago? Were we not, and was not the whole nation, grappling with that one great, common, universal interest, the opening of a communication between our ocean frontiers, and were we not already reckoning upon the quick and busy subjugation of nature throughout the interior of the continent to the uses of man, and dwelling with almost rapturous enthusiasm on the prospective enlargement of our commerce in the east, and of our political sway throughout the world? And what have we now here but the oblivion of death, covering the very memory of those great enterprises, and prospects, and hopes?

Senators from the non-slaveholding states: You want peace. Think well, I beseech you, before you yield the price now demanded, even for peace and rest from slavery agitation. France has got peace from republican agitation by a similar sacrifice. So has Poland; so has Hungary; and so, at last, has Ireland. Is the peace which either of those nations enjoys worth the price it cost? Is peace, obtained at such cost, ever a lasting peace?

Senators from the slaveholding states: You, too, suppose that you are securing peace as well as victory in this transaction. I tell you now, as I told you in 1850, that it is an error, an unnecessary error, to suppose, that because you exclude slavery from these halls to-day, that it will not revisit them to-morrow. You buried the Wilmot

proviso here then, and celebrated its obsequies with pomp and revelry. And here it is again to-day, stalking through these halls, clad in complete steel as before. Even if those whom you denounce as factionists in the north would let it rest, you yourselves must evoke it from its grave. The reason is obvious. Say what you will, do what you will, here, the interests of the non-slaveholding states and of the slaveholding states remain just the same; and they will remain just the same, until you shall cease to cherish and defend slavery, or we shall cease to honor and love freedom! You will not cease to cherish slavery. Do you see any signs that we are becoming indifferent to freedom? On the contrary, that old, traditional, hereditary sentiment of the north is more profound and more universal now than it ever was before. The slavery agitation you deprecate so much is an eternal struggle between conservatism and progress, between truth and error, between right and wrong. You may sooner, by act of congress, compel the sea to suppress its upheavings, and the round earth to extinguish its internal fires, than oblige the human mind to cease its inquirings, and the human heart to desist from its throbbings.

Suppose then, for a moment, that this agitation must go on hereafter as heretofore. Then, hereafter as heretofore, there will be need, on both sides, of moderation; and, to secure moderation, there will be need of mediation. Hitherto you have secured moderation by means of compromises, by tendering which, the great mediator, now no more, divided the people of the north. But then those in the north who did not sympathize with you in your complaints of aggression from that quarter, as well as those who did, agreed that if compromises should be effected, they would be chivalrously kept on your part. I cheerfully admit that they have been so kept until now. But hereafter, when having taken advantage, which in the north will be called fraudulent, of the last of those compromises, to become, as you will be called, the aggressors, by breaking the other, as will be alleged, in violation of plighted faith and honor, while the slavery agitation is rising higher than ever before, and while your ancient friends, and those whom you persist in regarding as your enemies, shall have been driven together by a common and universal sense of your injustice, what new mode of restoring peace and harmony will you then propose? What statesman will there be in the south, then, who can bear the flag of truce? What states-

man in the north who can mediate the acceptance of your new proposals? I think it will not be the senator from Illinois.

If, however, I err in all this, let us suppose that you succeed in suppressing political agitation of slavery in national affairs. Nevertheless, agitation of slavery must go on in some form; for all the world around you is engaged in it. It is, then, high time for you to consider where you may expect to meet it next. I much mistake if, in that case, you do not meet it there where we, who once were slaveholding states, as you now are, have met, and, happily for us, succumbed before it—namely, in the legislative halls, in the churches and schools, and at the fireside, within the states themselves. It is an angel of mercy with which, sooner or later, every slaveholding state must wrestle, and by which it must be overcome. Even if, by reason of this measure, it should the sooner come to that point, and although I am sure that you will not overcome freedom, but that freedom will overcome you, yet I do not look even then for disastrous or unhappy results. The institutions of our country are so framed, that the inevitable conflict of opinion on slavery, as on every other subject, cannot be otherwise than peaceful in its course and beneficent in its termination.

Nor shall I "bate one jot of heart or hope" in maintaining a just equilibrium of the non-slaveholding states, even if this ill-starred measure shall be adopted. The non-slaveholding states are teeming with an increase of freemen—educated, vigorous, enlightened, enterprising freemen—such freemen as neither England, nor Rome, nor even Athens, ever reared. Half a million of freemen from Europe annually augment that increase; and ten years hence half a million, twenty years hence a million of freemen from Asia will augment it still more. You may obstruct and so turn the direction of those peaceful armies away from Nebraska. So long as you shall leave them room on hill or prairie, by river side or in the mountain fastnesses, they will dispose of themselves peacefully and lawfully in the places you shall have left open to them; and there they will erect new states upon free soil, to be forever maintained and defended by free arms and aggrandized by free labor. American slavery, I know, has a large and ever-flowing spring, but it cannot pour forth its blackened tide in volumes like that I have described. If you are wise, these tides of freemen and of slaves will never meet, for they will not voluntarily commingle; but if, nevertheless, through your

own erroneous policy, their repulsive currents must be directed against each other, so that they needs must meet, then it is easy to see in that case which of them will overcome the resistance of the other, and which of them, thus overpowered, will roll back to drown the source which sent it forth.

"Man proposes, and God disposes." You may legislate, and abrogate, and abnegate, as you will, but there is a Superior Power that overrules all your actions and all your refusals to act, and, I fondly hope and trust, overrules them to the advancement of the happiness, greatness and glory of our country—that overrules, I know, not only all your actions and all your refusals to act, but all human events, to the distant but inevitable result of the equal and universal liberty of all men.

NEBRASKA AND KANSAS.

SECOND SPEECH.[1]

I RISE with no purpose of further resisting or even delaying the passage of this bill. Let its advocates have only a little patience, and they will soon reach the object for which they have struggled so earnestly and so long. The sun has set for the last time upon the guarantied and certain liberties of all the unsettled and unorganized portions of the American continent that lie within the jurisdiction of the United States. To-morrow's sun will rise in dim eclipse over them.[2] How long that obstruction shall last, is known only to the Power that directs and controls all human events. For myself, I know only this—that now no human power will prevent its coming on, and that its passing off will be hastened and secured by others than those now here, and perhaps by only those belonging to future generations.

It would be almost factious to offer further resistance to this measure here. Indeed, successful resistance was never expected to be made in this hall. The senate floor is an old battle-ground, on which

[1] On the return of the bill from the house of representatives with amendments, May 25, 1854. See memoir, page 26, present volume.
[2] An almost total eclipse of the sun actually occurred on that day—the 26th of May, 1854.—ED.

have been fought many contests, and always, at least since 1820, with fortune adverse to the cause of equal and universal freedom. We were only a few here who engaged in that cause in the beginning of this contest. All that we could hope to do—all that we did hope to do—was to organize and to prepare the issue for the house of representatives, to which the country would look for its decision as authoritative, and to awaken the country, that it might be ready for the appeal which would be made, whatever the decision of congress might be. We are no stronger now. Only fourteen at the first, it will be fortunate if, among the ills and accidents which surround us, we shall maintain that number to the end.

We are on the eve of the consummation of a great national transaction—a transaction which will close a cycle in the history of our country—and it is impossible not to desire to pause a moment and survey the scene around us and the prospect before us. However obscure we may individually be, our connection with this great transaction will perpetuate our names for the praise or for the censure of future ages, and perhaps in regions far remote. If, then, we had no other motive for our actions but that of an honest desire for a just fame, we could not be indifferent to that scene and that prospect. But individual interests and ambition sink into insignificance in view of the interests of our country and of mankind. These interests awaken, at least in me, an intense solicitude.

It was said by some in the beginning, and it has been said by others later in this debate, that it was doubtful whether it would be the cause of slavery or the cause of freedom that would gain advantages from the passage of this bill. I do not find it necessary to be censorious, nor even unjust to others, in order that my own course may be approved. I am sure that the honorable senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] did not mean that the slave states should gain an advantage over the free states, for he disclaimed it when he introduced the bill. I believe in all candor that the honorable senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS], who comes out at the close of the battle as one of the chiefest leaders of the victorious party, is sincere in declaring his own opinion that the slave states will gain no unjust advantage over the free states, because he disclaims it as a triumph in their behalf. Notwithstanding all this, however, what has occurred here and in the country, during this contest, has compelled a conviction that slavery will gain something, and freedom will endure a

severe, though I hope not an irretrievable loss. The slaveholding states are passive, quiet, content and satisfied with the prospective boon, and the free states are excited and alarmed with fearful forebodings and apprehensions. The impatience for the speedy passage of the bill manifested by its friends, betrays a knowledge that this is the condition of public sentiment in the free states. They thought in the beginning that it was necessary to guard the measure by inserting the Clayton amendment, which would exclude unnaturalized foreign inhabitants of the territories from the right of suffrage. And now they seem willing, with almost perfect unanimity, to relinquish that safeguard, rather than to delay the adoption of the principal measure for at most a year, perhaps for only a week or a day. Suppose that the senate should adhere to that condition, which so lately was thought so wise and so important—what then? The bill could only go back to the house of representatives, which must either yield or insist! In the one case or in the other, a decision in favor of the bill would be secured, for even if the house should disagree, the senate would have time to recede. But the majority will hazard nothing, even on a prospect so certain as this. They will recede at once, without a moment's further struggle, from the condition, and thus secure the passage of this bill, now to-night. Why such haste? Even if the question were to go to the country before a final decision here, what would there be wrong in that? There is no man living who will say that the country anticipated, or that *he* anticipated agitation of this measure in congress, when this congress was elected, or even when it assembled in December last.

Under such circumstances, and in the midst of agitation and excitement and debates, it is only fair to say that certainly the country has not decided in favor of the bill. The refusal, then, to let the question go to the country, is a conclusive proof that the slave states, as represented here, expect from the passage of this bill what the free states insist that they will lose by it, an advantage, a material advantage, and not a mere abstraction. There are men in the slave states, as in the free states, who insist always too pertinaciously upon mere abstractions. But that is not the policy of the slave states to-day. They are in earnest in seeking for and securing an object, and an important one. I believe they are going to have it. I do not know how long the advantage gained will last, nor how great or comprehensive it will be. Every senator who agrees with me in opinion must feel

as I do—that under such circumstances he can forego nothing that can be done decently, with due respect to difference of opinion, and consistently with the constitutional and settled rules of legislation, to place the true merits of the question before the country. Questions sometimes occur, which seem to have two right sides. Such were the questions that divided the English nation between Pitt and Fox—such the contest between the assailant and the defender of Quebec. The judgment of the world was suspended by its sympathies, and seemed ready to descend in favor of him who should be most gallant in conduct. And so, when both fell with equal chivalry on the same field, the survivors united in raising a common monument to the glorious but rival memories of Wolfe and Montcalm. But this contest involves a moral question. The slave states so present it. They maintain that African slavery is not erroneous, not unjust, not inconsistent with the advancing cause of human nature. Since they so regard it, I do not expect to see statesmen representing those states indifferent about a vindication of this system by the congress of the United States. On the other hand, we of the free states regard slavery as erroneous, unjust, oppressive, and therefore absolutely inconsistent with the principles of the American constitution and government. Who will expect us to be indifferent to the decisions of the American people and of mankind on such an issue?

Again: there is suspended on the issue of this contest the political equilibrium between the free and the slave states. It is no ephemeral question, no idle question, whether slavery shall go on increasing its influence over the central power here, or whether freedom shall gain the ascendency. I do not expect to see statesmen of the slave states indifferent on so momentous a question, and as little can it be expected that those of the free states will betray their own great cause. And now it remains for me to declare, in view of the decision of this controversy so near at hand, that I have seen nothing and heard nothing during its progress to change the opinions which at the earliest proper period I deliberately expressed. Certainly, I have not seen the evidence then promised, that the free states would acquiesce in the measure. As certainly, too, I may say that I have not seen the fulfillment of the promise that the history of the last thirty years would be revised, corrected, and amended, and that it would then appear that the country, during all that period, had been resting in prosperity and contentment and peace,

not upon a valid, constitutional, and irrevocable compromise between the slave states and the free states, but upon an unconstitutional and false, and even infamous, act of congressional usurpation.

On the contrary, I am now, if possible, more than ever satisfied that, after all this debate, the history of the country will go down to posterity just as it stood before, carrying to them the everlasting facts that until 1820 the congress of the United States legislated to prevent the introduction of slavery into new territories whenever that object was practicable; and that in that year they so far modified that policy, under alarming apprehensions of civil convulsion, by a constitutional enactment in the character of a compact, as to admit Missouri a new slave state; but upon the express condition, stipulated in favor of the free states, that slavery should be forever prohibited in all the residue of the existing and unorganized territory of the United States lying north of the parallel of 36° 30′ north latitude. Certainly, I find nothing to win my favor toward the bill in the proposition of the senator from Maryland [Mr. PEARCE], to restore the Clayton amendment, which was struck out in the house of representatives. So far from voting for that proposition, I shall vote against it now, as I did when it was under consideration here before, in accordance with the opinion adopted as early as any political opinions I ever had, and cherished as long, that the right of suffrage is not a mere conventional right, but an inherent natural right, of which no government can rightly deprive any adult man who is subject to its authority, and obligated to its support.

I hold, moreover, that inasmuch as every man is, by force of circumstances beyond his own control, a subject of government somewhere, he is, by the very constitution of human society, entitled to share equally in the conferring of political power on those who wield it, if he is not disqualified by crime; that in a despotic government he ought to be allowed arms, in a free government the ballot or the open vote, as a means of self-protection against unendurable oppression. I am not likely, therefore, to restore to this bill an amendment which would deprive it of an important feature imposed upon it by the house of representatives, and that one, perhaps, the only feature that harmonizes with my own convictions of justice. It is true that the house of representatives stipulate such suffrages for white men as a condition for opening it to the possible proscription and slavery of the African. I shall separate them. I

shall vote for the former, and against the latter, glad to get universal suffrage of white men, if only that can be gained now, and working right on, full of hope and confidence, for the prevention or the abrogation of slavery in the territories hereafter.

I am surprised at the pertinacity with which the honorable senator from Delaware, mine ancient and honorable friend [Mr. CLAYTON], perseveres in opposing the granting of the right of suffrage to the unnaturalized foreigner in the territories. Congress cannot deny him that right. Here is the third article of that convention by which Louisiana, including Kansas and Nebraska, was ceded to the United States:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion they profess."

The inhabitants of Kansas and Nebraska are citizens already, and by force of this treaty must continue to be, and as such to enjoy the right of suffrage, whatever laws you may make to the contrary. My opinions are well known, to wit: That slavery is not only an evil, but a local one, injurious and ultimately pernicious to society, wherever it exists, and in conflict with the constitutional principles of society in this country. I am not willing to extend nor to permit the extension of that local evil into regions now free within our empire. I know that there are some who differ from me, and who regard the constitution of the United States as an instrument which sanctions slavery as well as freedom. But if I could admit a proposition so incongruous with the letter and spirit of the federal constitution, and the known sentiments of its illustrious founders, and so should conclude that slavery was national, I must still cherish the opinion that it is an evil; and because it is a national one, I am the more firmly held and bound to prevent an increase of it, tending, as I think it manifestly does, to the weakening and ultimate overthrow of the constitution itself, and therefore to the injury of all mankind. I know there have been states which have endured long, and achieved much, which tolerated slavery; but that was not the slavery of caste, like African slavery. Such slavery tends to demoralize equally the subjected race and the superior one. It has

been the absence of such slavery from Europe that has given her nations their superiority over other countries in that hemisphere. Slavery, wherever it exists, begets fear, and fear is the parent of weakness. What is the secret of that eternal, sleepless anxiety in the legislative halls, and even at the firesides, of the slave states, always asking new stipulations, new compromises and abrogations of compromises, new assumptions of power and abnegations of power, but fear? It is the apprehension that, even if safe now, they will not always or long be secure against some invasion or some aggression from the free states. What is the secret of the humiliating part which proud old Spain is acting at this day, trembling between alarms of American intrusion into Cuba on one side, and British dictation on the other, but the fact that she has cherished slavery so long, and still cherishes it, in the last of her American colonial possessions? Thus far, Kansas and Nebraska are safe, under the laws of 1820, against the introduction of this element of national debility and decline. The bill before us, as we are assured, contains a great principle, a glorious principle; and yet that principle, when fully ascertained, proves to be nothing less than the subversion of that security, not only within the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, but within all the other present and future new territories of the United States. Thus it is quite clear that it is not a principle that is involved, but that those who crowd this measure with so much zeal and earnestness, must expect that either freedom or slavery shall gain something by it in those regions. The case, then, stands thus in Kansas and Nebraska: Freedom may lose, but certainly can gain nothing; while slavery may gain, but as certainly can lose nothing.

So far as I am concerned, the time for looking on the dark side has passed. I feel quite sure that slavery at most can get nothing more than Kansas; while Nebraska, the wider northern region, will, under existing circumstances, escape, for the reason that its soil and climate are uncongenial with the staples of slave culture—rice, sugar, cotton, and tobacco. Moreover, since the public attention has been so well and so effectually directed toward the subject, I cherish a hope that slavery may be prevented even from gaining a foothold in Kansas. Congress only gives consent, but it does not and cannot introduce slavery there. Slavery will be embarrassed by its own over-grasping spirit. No one, I am sure, anticipates the possible

reëstablishment of the African slave trade. The tide of emigration to Kansas is therefore to be supplied there solely by the domestic fountain of slave production. But slavery has also other regions besides Kansas to be filled from that fountain. There are all of New Mexico and all of Utah already within the United States; and then there is Cuba, that consumes slave labor and life as fast as any one of the slaveholding states can supply it; and besides these regions, there remains all of Mexico down to the isthmus. The stream of slave labor flowing from so small a fountain, and broken into several divergent channels, will not cover so great a field; and it is reasonably to be hoped that the part of it nearest to the north pole will be the last to be inundated.

But African slave emigration is to compete with free emigration of white men, and the source of this latter tide is as ample as the civilization of the two entire continents. The honorable senator from Delaware mentioned, as if it were a startling fact, that twenty thousand European immigrants arrived in New York in one month. He has stated the fact with too much moderation. On my return to the capital, a day or two ago, I met twelve thousand of these immigrants who had arrived in New York on one morning, and who had thronged the churches on the following sabbath, to return thanks for deliverance from the perils of the sea, and for their arrival in the land, not of slavery, but of liberty. I also thank God for their escape, and for their coming. They are now on their way westward, and the news of the passage of this bill, preceding them, will speed many of them toward Kansas and Nebraska. Such arrivals are not extraordinary—they occur almost every week; and the immigration from Germany, from Great Britain, and from Norway, and from Sweden, during the European war, will rise to six or seven hundred thousand souls in a year. And with this tide is to be mingled one rapidly swelling from Asia and from the islands of the South seas. All the immigrants, under this bill as the house of representatives overruling you have ordered, will be good, loyal, liberty-loving, slavery-fearing citizens. Come on, then, gentlemen of the slave states. Since there is no escaping your challenge, I accept it in behalf of the cause of freedom. We will engage in competition for the virgin soil of Kansas, and God give the victory to the side which is stronger in numbers as it is in right.

There are, however, earnest advocates of this bill, who do not expect, and who, I suppose, do not desire, that slavery shall gain possession of Nebraska. What do they expect to gain? The honorable senator from Indiana says that by thus obliterating the Missouri compromise restriction, they will gain a *tabula rasa*, on which the inhabitants of Kansas and Nebraska may write whatever they will. This is the great principle of the bill, as he understands it. Well, what gain is there in that? You obliterate a constitution of freedom. If they write a new constitution of freedom, can the new be better than the old? If they write a constitution of slavery, will it not be a worse one? I ask the honorable senator that! But the honorable senator says that the people of Nebraska will have the privilege of establishing institutions for themselves. They have now the privilege of establishing free institutions. Is it a privilege, then, to establish slavery? If so, what a mockery are all our constitutions, which prevent the inhabitants from capriciously subverting free institutions and establishing institutions of slavery? It is a sophism, a subtlety, to talk of conferring upon a country, already secure in the blessings of freedom, the power of self-destruction.

What mankind everywhere want, is not the removal of the constitutions of freedom which they have, that they may make at their pleasure constitutions of slavery or of freedom, but the privilege of retaining constitutions of freedom when they already have them, and the removal of constitutions of slavery when they have them, that they may establish constitutions of freedom in their place. We hold on tenaciously to all existing constitutions of freedom. Who denounces any man for diligently adhering to such constitutions? Who would dare to denounce any one for disloyalty to our existing constitutions, if they were constitutions of despotism and slavery? But it is supposed by some that this principle is less important in regard to Kansas and Nebraska than as a general one—a general principle applicable to all other present and future territories of the United States. Do honorable senators then indeed suppose they are establishing a principle at all? If so, I think they egregiously err, whether the principle is either good or bad, right or wrong. They are not establishing it, and cannot establish it in this way. You subvert one law capriciously, by making another law in its place. That is all. Will your law have any more weight, authority, solemnity, or binding force on future congresses than the

first had? You abrogate the law of your predecessors—others will have equal power and equal liberty to abrogate yours. You allow no barriers around the old law, to protect it from abrogation. You erect none around your new law, to stay the hand of future innovators.

On what ground do you expect the new law to stand? If you are candid, you will confess that you rest your assumption on the ground that the free states will never agitate repeal, but always *acquiesce*. It may be that you are right. I am not going to predict the course of the free states. I claim no authority to speak for them, and still less to say what they will do. But I may venture to say, that if they shall not repeal this law, it will not be because they are not strong enough to do it. They have power in the house of representatives greater than that of the slave states, and, when they choose to exercise it, a power greater even here in the senate. The free states are not dull scholars, even in practical political strategy. When you shall have taught them that a compromise law establishing freedom can be abrogated, and the Union nevertheless stand, you will have let them into another secret, namely: that a law permitting or establishing slavery can be repealed, and the Union nevertheless remain firm. If you inquire why they do not stand by their rights and their interests more firmly, I will tell you to the best of my ability. It is because they are conscious of their strength, and therefore unsuspecting, and slow to apprehend danger. The reason why you prevail in so many contests, is because you are in perpetual fear.

There cannot be a convocation of abolitionists, however impracticable, in Faneuil hall or the Tabernacle, though it consists of men and women who have separated themselves from all effective political parties, and who have renounced all political agencies, even though they resolve that they will vote for nobody, not even for themselves, to carry out their purposes, and though they practise on that resolution, but you take alarm, and your agitation renders necessary such compromises as those of 1820 and 1850. We are young in the arts of politics; you are old. We are strong; you are weak. We are, therefore, over-confident, careless, and indifferent; you are vigilant and active. These are traits that redound to your praise. They are mentioned not in your disparagement. I say only that there may be an extent of intervention, of aggression,

on your side, which may induce the north, at some time, either in this or in some future generation, to adopt your tactics and follow your example. Remember now, that by unanimous consent, this new law will be a repealable statute, exposed to all the chances of the Missouri compromise. It stands an infinitely worse chance of endurance than that compromise did.

The Missouri compromise was a transaction which wise, learned, patriotic statesmen agreed to surround and fortify with the principles of a compact for mutual considerations, passed and executed, and therefore, although not irrepealable in fact, yet irrepealable in honor and conscience; and, down at least until this very session of the congress of the United States, it has had the force and authority not merely of an act of congress, but of a covenant between the free states and the slave states, scarcely less sacred than the constitution itself. Now, then, who are your contracting parties in the law establishing governments in Kansas and Nebraska, and abrogating the Missouri compromise? What are the equivalents in this law? What has the north given, and what has the south got back that makes this a contract? Who pretends that it is anything more than an ordinary act of ordinary legislation? If, then, a law which has all the forms and solemnities recognized by common consent as a compact, and is covered with traditions, cannot stand amid this shuffling of this balance between the free states and the slave states, tell me what chance this new law that you are passing will have?

You are, moreover setting a precedent which abrogates all compromises. Four years ago, you obtained the consent of a portion of the free states—enough to render the effort at immediate repeal or resistance alike impossible—to what we regarded as an unconstitutional act for the surrender of fugitive slaves. That was declared, by the common consent of the persons acting in the name of the two parties, the slave states and free states in congress, an irrepealable law—not even to be questioned, although it violated the constitution. In establishing this new principle, you expose that law also to the chances of repeal. You not only so expose the fugitive slave law, but there is no solemnity about the articles for the annexation of Texas to the United States, which does not hang about the Missouri compromise; and when you have shown that the Missouri compromise can be repealed, then the articles for the annexation of Texas are subject to the will and pleasure and the caprice of a tem-

porary majority in congress. Do you, then, expect that the free states are to observe compacts, and you to be at liberty to break them; that they are to submit to laws and leave them on the statute book, however unconstitutional and however grievous, and that you are to rest under no such obligation? I think it is not a reasonable expectation. Say, then, who from the north will be bound to admit Kansas, when Kansas shall come in here, if she shall come as a slave state?

The honorable senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS], and I know he is as sincere as he is ardent, says if he shall be here when Kansas comes as a free state, he will vote for her admission. I doubt not that he would; but he will not be here, for the very reason, if there be no other, that he would vote that way. When Oregon or Minnesota shall come here for admission—within one year, or two years, or three years from this time—we shall then see what your new principle is worth in its obligation upon the slave-holding states. No; you establish no principle, you only abrogate a principle which was established for your own security as well as ours; and while you think you are abnegating and resigning all power and all authority on this subject into the hands of the people of the territories, you are only getting over a difficulty in settling this question in the organization of two new territories, by postponing it till they come here to be admitted as states, slave or free.

In saying that your new principle will not be established by this bill, I reason from obvious, clear, well-settled principles of human nature. Slavery and freedom are antagonistical elements in this country. The founders of the constitution framed it with a knowledge of that antagonism, and suffered it to continue, that it might work out its own ends. There is a commercial antagonism, an irreconcilable one, between the systems of free labor and slave labor. They have been at war with each other ever since the government was established, and that war is to continue forever. The contest, when it ripens between these two antagonistic elements, is to be settled somewhere; it is to be settled in the seat of central power, in the federal legislature. The constitution makes it the duty of the central government to determine questions as often as they shall arise in favor of one or the other party, and refers the decision of them to the majority of the votes in the two houses of congress. It will come back here, then, in spite of all the efforts to escape from it.

This antagonism must end either in a separation of the antagonistic parties — the slaveholding states and the free states — or, secondly, in the complete establishment of the influence of the slave power over the free—or else on the other hand, in the establishment of the superior influence of freedom over the interests of slavery. It will not be terminated by a voluntary secession of either party. Commercial interests bind the slave states and the free states together in links of gold that are riveted with iron, and they cannot be broken by passion or by ambition. Either party will submit to the ascendency of the other, rather than yield to the commercial advantages of this Union. Political ties bind the Union together—a common necessity, and not merely a common necessity, but the common interests of empire—of such empire as the world has never before seen. The control of the national power is the control of the great western continent; and the control of this continent is to be in a very few years the controlling influence in the world. Who is there north, that hates slavery so much, or who, south, that hates emancipation so intensely, that he can attempt, with any hope of success, to break a Union thus forged and welded together? I have always heard, with equal pity and disgust, threats of disunion in the free states, and similar threats in the slaveholding states. I know that men may rave in the heat of passion, and under great political excitement; but I know that when it comes to a question whether this Union shall stand, either with freedom or with slavery, the masses will uphold it, and it will stand until some inherent vice in its constitution, not yet disclosed, shall cause its dissolution. Now, entertaining these opinions, there are for me only two alternatives, viz.: either to let slavery gain unlimited sway, or so to exert what little power and influence I may have, as to secure, if I can, the ultimate predominance of freedom.

In doing this, I do no more than those who believe the slave power is rightest, wisest, and best, are doing, and will continue to do, with my free consent, to establish its complete supremacy. If they shall succeed, I still shall be, as I have been, a loyal citizen. If we succeed, I know they will be loyal also, because it will be safest, wisest, and best, for them to be so. The question is one, not of a day, or of a year, but of many years, and for aught I know, many generations. Like all other great political questions, it will be attended sometimes by excitement, sometimes by passion, and

sometimes, perhaps, even by faction; but it is sure to be settled in a constitutional way, without any violent shock to society, or to any of its great interests. It is, moreover, sure to be settled rightly; because it will be settled under the benign influences of republicanism and Christianity, according to the principles of truth and justice, as ascertained by human reason. In pursuing such a course, it seems to me obviously as wise as it is necessary to save all existing laws and constitutions which are conservative of freedom, and to permit, as far as possible, the establishment of no new ones in favor of slavery; and thus to turn away the thoughts of the states which tolerate slavery from political efforts to perpetuate what in its nature cannot be perpetual, to the more wise and benign policy of emancipation.

This, in my humble judgment, is the simple, easy path of duty for the American statesman. I will not contemplate that other alternative—the greater ascendency of the slave power. I believe that if it ever shall come, the voice of freedom will cease to be heard in these halls, whatever may be the evils and dangers which slavery shall produce. I say this without disrespect for representatives of slave states, and I say it because the rights of petition and of debate on that subject are effectually suppressed—necessarily suppressed—in all the slave states, and because they are not always held in reverence even now, in the two houses of congress. When freedom of speech on a subject of such vital interest shall have ceased to exist in congress, then I shall expect to see slavery not only luxuriating in all new territories, but stealthily creeping even into the free states themselves. Believing this, and believing, also, that complete responsibility of the government to the people is essential to public and private safety, and that decline and ruin are sure to follow, always, on the train of slavery, I am sure that this will be no longer a land of freedom and constitutional liberty when slavery shall have thus become paramount. *Auferre, trucidare falsis nominibus imperium atque ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.*

I have always said that I should not despond, even if this fearful measure should be effected; nor do I now despond. Although, reasoning from my present convictions, I should not have voted for the compromise of 1820, I have labored, in the very spirit of those who established it, to save the landmark of freedom which it assigned. I have not spoken irreverently, even of the compromise

of 1850, which, as all men know, I opposed earnestly and with diligence. Nevertheless, I have always preferred the compromises of the constitution, and have wanted no others. I feared all others. This was a leading principle of the great statesman of the south [Mr. CALHOUN]. Said he:

"I see my way in the constitution; I cannot in a compromise. A compromise is but an act of congress. It may be overruled at any time. It gives us no security. But the constitution is a statute. It is a rock on which we can stand, and on which we can meet our friends from the non-slaveholding states. It is a firm and stable ground, on which we can better stand in opposition to fanaticism than on the shifting sands of compromise. Let us be done with compromises. Let us go back and stand upon the constitution."

I stood upon this ground in 1850, defending freedom upon it as Mr. CALHOUN did in defending slavery. I was overruled then, and I have waited since without proposing to abrogate any compromises.

It has been no proposition of mine to abrogate them now; but the proposition has come from another quarter—from an adverse one. It is about to prevail. The shifting sands of compromise are passing from under my feet, and they are now, without agency of my own, taking hold again on the rock of the constitution. It shall be no fault of mine if they do not remain firm. This seems to me auspicious of better days and wiser legislation. Through all the darkness and gloom of the present hour, bright stars are breaking, that inspire me with hope, and excite me to perseverance. They show that the day of compromises has passed forever, and that henceforward all great questions between freedom and slavery legitimately coming here—and none other can come—shall be decided, as they ought to be, upon their merits, by a fair exercise of legislative power, and not by bargains of equivocal prudence, if not of doubtful morality.

The house of representatives has, and it always will have, an increasing majority of members from the free states. On this occasion, that house has not been altogether faithless to the interests of the free states; for although it has taken away the charter of freedom from Kansas and Nebraska, it has at the same time told this proud body, in language which compels acquiescence, that in submitting the question of its restoration, it would submit it not merely to interested citizens, but to the alien inhabitants of the territories also. So the great interests of humanity are, after all, thanks to the

house of representatives, and thanks to God, submitted to the voice of human nature.

I see one more sign of hope. The great support of slavery in the south has been its alliance with the democratic party of the north. By means of that alliance it obtained paramount influence in this government about the year 1800, which, from that time to this, with but few and slight interruptions, it has maintained. While democracy in the north has thus been supporting slavery in the south, the people of the north have been learning more profoundly the principles of republicanism and of free government. It is an extraordinary circumstance, which you, sir, the present occupant of the chair [Mr. STUART], I am sure, will not gainsay, that at this moment, when there seems to be a more complete divergence of the federal government in favor of slavery than ever before, the sentiment of universal liberty is stronger in all free states than it ever was before. With that principle the present democratic party must now come into a closer contest. Their prestige of democracy is fast waning, by reason of the hard service which their alliance with their slaveholding brethren has imposed upon them. That party perseveres, as indeed it must, by reason of its very constitution, in that service, and thus comes into closer conflict with elements of true democracy, and for that reason is destined to lose, and is fast losing, the power which it has held so firmly and so long. That power will not be restored until the principle established here now shall be reversed, and a constitution shall be given, not only to Kansas and Nebraska, but also to every other national territory, which will be, not a *tabula rasa*, but a constitution securing equal, universal, and perpetual freedom.

THE IMMEDIATE ADMISSION OF KANSAS.[1]

TO OBTAIN empire is easy and common; to govern it well is difficult and rare indeed. I salute the congress of the United States in the exercise of its most important function, that of extending the federal constitution over added domains, and I salute especially the senate in the most august of all its manifold characters, itself a congress of thirty-one free, equal, sovereign states, assembled to decide

[1] Speech in the United States Senate, April 9, 1856. See Memoir, *ante*, page 39.

whether the majestic and fraternal circle shall be opened to receive yet another free, equal and sovereign state.

The constitution prescribes only two qualificatious for new states, namely—a substantial civil community, and a republican government. Kansas has both of these.

The circumstances of Kansas, and her relations towards the Union, are peculiar, anomalous, and deeply interesting. The United States acquired the province of Louisiana (which included the present territory of Kansas) from France, in 1803, by a treaty, in which they agreed that its inhabitants should be incorporated into the Federal Union, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States. Nevertheless, Kansas was in 1820 assigned as a home for an indefinite period to several savage Indian tribes, and closed against immigration and all other than aboriginal civilization, but not without a cotemporaneous pledge to the American people and to mankind, that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude should be tolerated therein forever. In 1854, congress directed a removal of the Indian tribes, and organized and opened Kansas to civilization, but by the same act rescinded the pledge of perpetual dedication to freedom, and substituted for it another, which declared that the [future] people of Kansas should be left perfectly free to establish or to exclude slavery, as they should decide through the action of a republican government which congress modeled and authorized them to establish, under the protection of the United States. Notwithstanding this latter pledge, when the newly associated people of Kansas, in 1855, were proceeding with the machinery of popular elections, in the manner prescribed by congress, to choose legislative bodies for the purpose of organizing that republican government, armed bands of invaders from the state of Missouri entered the territory, seized the polls, overpowered or drove away the inhabitants, usurped the elective franchise, deposited false and spurious ballots without regard to regularity of qualification or of numbers, procured official certificates of the result by fraud and force, and thus created and constituted legislative bodies to act for and in the name of the people of the territory. These legislative bodies afterward assembled, assumed to be a legitimate legislature, set forth a code of municipal laws, created public offices and filled them with officers appointed for con-

lerable periods by themselves, and thus established a complete and ective foreign tyranny over the people of the territory. These gh-handed transactions were consummated with the expressed rpose of establishing African slavery as a permanent institution thin the territory by force, in violation of the natural rights of e people solemnly guarantied to them by the congress of the nited States. The president of the United States has been an cessory to these political transactions, with full complicity in gard to the purpose for which they were committed. He has opted the usurpation, and made it his own, and he is now mainning it with the military arm of the republic. Thus Kansas has en revolutionized, and she now lies subjugated and prostrated at e foot of the president of the United States, while he, through the ency of a foreign tyranny established within her borders, is forcily introducing and establishing slavery there, in contempt and fiance of the organic law. These extraordinary transactions have en attended by civil commotions, in which property, life, and libty, have been exposed to violence, and these commotions still ntinue to threaten, not only the territory itself, but also the adjacent ites, with the calamities and disasters of civil war.

I am fully aware of the gravity of the charges against the presint of the United States which this statement of the condition and ations of Kansas imports. I shall proceed, without fear and witht reserve, to make them good. The maxim, that a sacred veil ust be drawn over the beginning of all governments, does not hold der our system. I shall first call the accuser into the presence of e senate—then examine the defenses which the president has made and, last, submit the evidences by which he is convicted.

The people of Kansas know whether these charges are true or se. They have adopted them, and, on the ground of the high litical necessity which the wrongs they have endured, and are yet during, and the dangers through which they have already passed, d the perils to which they are yet exposed, have created, they ve provisionally organized themselves as a state, and that state is w here, by its two chosen senators and one representative, standg outside at the doors of congress, applying to be admitted into e Union, as a means of relief indispensable for the purposes of ace, freedom and safety. This new state is the president's responble accuser.

The president of the United States, without waiting for the appearance of his accuser at the capital, anticipated the accusations, and submitted his defenses against them to congress. The first one of these defenses was contained in his annual message, which was communicated to congress on the 30th of December, 1855. I examine it. You shall see at once that the president's mind was oppressed—was full of something, too large and burdensome to be concealed, and yet too critical to be told.

Mark, if you please, the state of the case at that time. So early as August, 1855, the people of Kansas had denounced the legislature. They had at voluntary elections chosen Mr A. H. Reeder to represent them in the present congress, instead of J. W. Whitfield, who held a certificate of election under the authority of the legislature. They had also, on the 23d day of October, 1855, by similar voluntary elections, constituted at Topeka an organic convention, which framed a constitution for the projected state. They had also, on the 15th of December, 1855, at similar voluntary elections, adopted that constitution, and its tenor was fully known. It provided for elections to be held throughout the new state on the 15th of January, 1856, to fill the offices created by it, and it also required the executive and legislative officers, thus to be chosen, to assemble at Topeka on the 4th day of March, 1856, to inaugurate the new state provisionally, and to take the necessary means for the appointment of senators, who, together with a representative already chosen, should submit the constitution to congress at an early day, and apply for the admission of the state of Kansas into the Union. All these proceedings had been based on the grounds that the territorial authorities of Kansas had been established by armed foreign usurpation, and were nevertheless sustained by the president of the United States. A constitutional obligation required the president "to give to congress," in his annual message, "information of the state of the Union." Here is all "the information" which the president gave to congress concerning the events in Kansas, and its relations to the Union:

"In the territory of Kansas, there have been acts prejudicial to good order, but as yet none have occurred under circumstances to justify the interposition of the federal executive. That could only be in case of obstruction to federal law, or of organized resistance to territorial law, assuming the character of insurrection, which, if it should occur, it would be my duty promptly to overcome and sup-

press. I cherish the hope, however, that the occurrence of any such untoward event will be prevented by the sound sense of the people of the territory, who by its organic law, possessing the right to determine their own domestic institutions, are entitled, while deporting themselves peacefully, to the free exercise of that right, and must be protected in the enjoyment of it, without interference on the part of the citizens of any of the states."

This information implies, that no invasion, usurpation, or tyranny, has been committed within the territory by strangers; and that the provisional state organization now going forward is not only unnecessary, but also prejudicial to good order, and insurrectionary. It menaces the people of Kansas with a threat, that the president will "overcome and suppress" them. It mocks them with a promise, that, if they shall hereafter deport themselves properly, under the control of authorities by which they have been disfranchised, in determining institutions which have been already forcibly determined for them by foreign invasion, that then they "must be protected against interference by the citizens of any of the states."

The president, however, not content with a statement so obscure and unfair, devotes a third part of the annual message to argumentative speculations bearing on the character of his accuser. Each state has two and no more senators in the senate of the United States. In determining the apportionment of representatives in the house of representatives, and in the electoral colleges among the states, three-fifths of all the slaves in any state are enumerated. The slaveholding or non-slaveholding character of a state is determined, not at the time of its admission into the Union as a state, but at that earlier period of its political life in which, being called a territory, it is politically dependent on the United States, or on some foreign sovereign. Slavery is tolerated in some of the states, and forbidden in others. Affecting the industrial and economical systems of the several states, as slavery and freedom do, this diversity of practice concerning them early worked out a corresponding difference of conditions, interests, and ambitions, among the states, and divided and arrayed them into two classes. The balance of political power between these two classes in the federal system is sensibly affected by the accession of any new state to either of them. Each state, therefore, watches jealously the settlement, growth, and inchoate slaveholding and non-slaveholding characters of territories, which may ultimately come into the Union as states. It has resulted from these circumstances, that slavery, in relations purely political

and absolutely federal, is an element which enters with more or less activity into many national questions of finance, of revenue, of expenditure, of protection, of free trade, of patronage, of peace, of war, of annexation, of defense, and of conquest, and modifies opinions concerning constructions of the constitution, and the distribution of powers between the Union and the several states by which it is constituted. Slavery, under these political and federal aspects alone, enters into the transactions in Kansas, with which the president and congress are concerned. Nevertheless, he disingenuously alludes to those transactions in his defense, as if they were identified with that moral discussion of slavery which he regards as odious and alarming, and without any other claim to consideration. Thus he alludes to the question before us as belonging to a

"Political agitation concerning a matter which consists to a great extent of exaggeration of inevitable evils, or over-zeal in social improvement, or mere imagination of grievance, having but a remote connection with any of the constitutional functions of the federal government, and menacing the stability of the constitution and the integrity of the Union."

In like manner the president assails and stigmatizes those who defend and maintain the cause of Kansas, as

"Men of narrow views and sectional purposes, engaged in those wild and chimerical schemes of social change which are generated one after another in the unstable minds of visionary sophists and interested agitators—'mad men, raising the storm of frenzy and faction,' 'sectional agitators,' 'enemies of the constitution, who have surrendered themselves so far to a fanatical devotion to the supposed interests of the relatively few Africans in the United States, as totally to abandon and disregard the interests of the twenty-five millions of Americans, and trample under foot the injunctions of moral and constitutional obligation, and to engage in plans of vindictive hostility against those who are associated with them in the enjoyment of the common heritage of our free institutions.'"

The president's defense on this occasion, if not a matter simply personal, is at least one of temporary and ephemeral importance. Possibly, all the advantages he will gain by transferring to his accuser a portion of the popular prejudice against abolition and abolitionists, can be spared to him. It would be wise, however, for those whose interests are inseparable from slavery, to reflect that abolition will gain an equivalent benefit from the identification of the president's defense with their cherished institution. Abolition is a slow but irrepressible uprising of principles of natural justice and human-

ity, obnoxious to prejudice, because they conflict inconveniently with existing material, social, and political interests. It belongs to others than statesmen, charged with the care of present interests, to conduct the social reformation of mankind in its broadest bearings. I leave to abolitionists their own work of self-vindication. I may, however, remind slaveholders that there is a time when oppression and persecution cease to be effectual against such movements; and then the odium they have before unjustly incurred becomes an element of strength and power. Christianity, blindly maligned during three centuries, by prætors, governors, senates, councils, and emperors, towered above its enemies in a fourth; and even the cross on which its founder had expired, and which therefore was the emblem of its shame, became the sign under which it went forth evermore thereafter, conquering and to conquer. Abolition is yet only in its first century.

The president raises in his defense a false issue, and elaborates an irrelevant argument to prove that congress has no right or power, nor has any sister state any right or power, to interfere within a slave state, by legislation or force, to abolish slavery therein—as if you, or I, or any other responsible man, ever maintained the contrary.

The president distorts the constitution from its simple text, so as to make it expressly and directly defend, protect, and guaranty African slavery. Thus he alleges that "the government" which resulted from the Revolution was a "Federal Republic of the free white men of the colonies," whereas, on the contrary, the Declaration of Independence asserts the political equality of all men, and even the constitution itself carefully avoids any political recognition, not merely of slavery, but of the diversity of races. The president represents the fathers as having contemplated and provided for a permanent increase of the number of slaves in some of the states, and therefore forbidden congress to touch slavery in the way of attack or offense, and as having therefore also placed it under the general safeguard of the constitution; whereas the fathers, by authorizing congress to abolish the African slave trade after 1808, as a means of attack, inflicted on slavery in the states a blow, of which they expected it to languish immediately, and ultimately to expire.

The president closes his defense in the annual message with a deliberate assault, very incongruous in such a place, upon some of

the northern states. At the same time he abstains, with marked caution, from naming the accused states. They, however, receive a compliment at his hands, by way of giving keenness to his rebuke, which enables us to identify them. They are northern states "which were conspicuous in founding the republic." All of the original northern states were conspicuous in that great transaction. All of them, therefore, are accused. The offense charged is, that they disregard their constitutional obligations, and although "conscious of their inability to heal admitted and palpable social evils of their own, confessedly within their jurisdiction, they engage in an offensive, hopeless, and illegal undertaking, to reform the domestic institutions of the southern states, at the peril of the very existence of the constitution, and of all the countless benefits which it has conferred." I challenge the president to the proof, in behalf of Massachusetts; although I have only the interest common to all Americans and to all men in her great fame. What one corporate or social evil is there, of which she is conscious, and conscious also of inability to heal it? Is it ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, vice, crime, public disorder, poverty, or disease, afflicting the minds or the bodies of her people? There she stands. Survey her universities, colleges, academies, observatories, primary schools, Sunday schools, penal codes, and penitentiaries. Descend into her quarries, walk over her fields and through her gardens, observe her manufactories of a thousand various fabrics, watch her steamers ascending every river and inlet on your own coast, and her ships, displaying their canvas on every sea; follow her fishermen in their adventurous voyages from her own and adjacent bays to the icy ocean under either pole; and then return and enter her hospitals, which cure or relieve suffering humanity in every condition and at every period of life, from the lying-in to the second childhood, and which not only restore sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb, but also bring back wandering reason to the insane, and teach even the idiot to think! Massachusetts, sir, is a model of states, worthy of all honor; and though she was most conspicuous of all the states in the establishment of republican institutions here, she is even more conspicuous still for the municipal wisdom with which she has made them contribute to the welfare of her people, and to the greatness of the republic itself.

In behalf of New York, for whom it is my right and duty to speak, I defy the presidential accuser. Mark her tranquil magnanimity, which becomes a state for whose delivery from tyranny Schuyler devised and labored, who received her political constitution from Hamilton, her intellectual and physical development from Clinton, and her lessons in humanity from Jay. As she waves her wand over the continent, trade forsakes the broad natural channels which conveyed it before to the Delaware and Chesapeake bays, and to the gulfs of St. Lawrence and Mexico, and obedient to her command pours itself through her artificial channels into her own once obscure seaport. She stretches her wand again towards the ocean, and the commerce of all the continents concentrates itself at her feet; and with it, strong and full floods of immigration ride in, contributing labor, capital, art, valor, and enterprise, to perfect and embellish our ever-widening empire.

When, and on what occasion, has Massachusetts or New York officiously and illegally intruded herself within the jurisdiction of sister states, to modify or reform their institutions? No, no, sir. Their faults have been quite different. They have conceded too often and too much for their own just dignity and influence in federal administration, to the querulous complaints of the states in whose behalf the president arraigns them. I thank the president for the insult which, though so deeply unjust, was perhaps needful to arouse them to their duty in this great emergency.

The president, in this connection, reviews the acquisitions of new domain, the organization of new territories, and the admission of new states, and arrives at results which must be as agreeably surprising to the slave states, as they are astounding to the free states. He finds that the former have been altogether guiltless of political ambition, while he convicts the latter not only of unjust territorial aggrandizement, but also of false and fraudulent clamor against the slave states, to cover their own aggressions. Notwithstanding the president's elaborated misconceptions, these historical facts remain, namely—that no acquisition whatever has ever been made at the instance of the free states, and with a view to their aggrandizement; that Louisiana and Florida, incidentally acquired for general and important national objects, have already yielded to the slave states three states of their own class, while Texas was avowedly annexed as a means of security to slavery, and one slave state has been

already admitted from that acquisition, and congress has stipulated for the admission of four more; that by way of equivalent for the admission of California a free state, the slave states have obtained a virtual repeal of the Mexican law which forbade slavery in New Mexico and Utah; and that, as a consequence of that extraordinary legislation, congress has also rescinded the prohibition of slavery, which, in 1820, was extended over all that part of Louisiana, except Missouri, which lies north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes of north latitude. Sir, the real crime of the northern states is this: they are forty degrees too high on the arc of north latitude.

I dismiss for the present the president's first defense against the accusation of the new state of Kansas.

On the 24th of January, 1856, when no important event had happened which was unknown at the date of the president's annual message, he submitted to congress his second defense, in the form of a special message. In this paper, the president deplores, as the cause of all the troubles which have occurred in Kansas, delays of the organization of the territory, which have been permitted by the governor, Mr. Reeder. The organic law was passed by congress on the 31st of May, 1854, but on that day there was not one lawful elector, citizen, or inhabitant, within the territory, while the question, whether slavery or universal freedom should be established there, was devolved practically on the first legislative bodies to be elected by the people who were to become thereafter the inhabitants of Kansas. The election for the first legislative bodies was appointed by the governor to be held on the 30th of March, 1855; and the 2d day of July, 1855, was designated for the organization of the legislative assembly. The only civilized community that was in contact with the new territory was Missouri, a slaveholding state, at whose instance the prohibition of slavery within the territory had been abrogated, so that she might attempt to colonize it with slaves. Immigrants were invited not only from all parts of the United States, but also from all other parts of the world, with a pledge that the people of the new territory should be left perfectly free to establish or prohibit slavery. A special election, however, was held within the territory on the 29th day of November, 1854, without any preliminary census of the inhabitants, for the purpose of choosing a delegate who might sit without a right to vote in congress, during the second session of the thirty-third congress, which was to begin

on the first Monday of December, 1854, and to end on the third day of March, 1855. Mr. J. W. Whitfield was certified to be elected. There were vehement complaints of illegality in the election, but his title was nevertheless not contested, for the palpable reasons, that an investigation, under the circumstances, of the territory, during so short a session of congress, would be impossible, and that the question was of inconsiderable magnitude. Yet the president laments that the governor neglected to order the first election for the legislative bodies of the new territory to be held simultaneously with that hurried congressional election. He assign his reasons:

"Any question appertaining to the qualifications of persons voting as the people of the territory would (in that case, incidentally) have necessarily passed under the supervision of congress (meaning the house of representatives), and would have been determined before conflicting passions had been inflamed by time, and before an opportunity would have been afforded for systematic interference by the people of individual states."

Could the president, in any explicit arrangement of words, more distinctly have confessed his disappointment in failing to secure a merely formal election of legislative bodies within the territory, in fraud of the organic law, of the people of Kansas, and of the cause of natural justice and humanity?

The president then proceeds to launch severe denunciations against what he calls a propagandist attempt to colonize the territory with opponents of slavery. The whole American continent has been undergoing a process of colonization, in many forms, throughout a period of three hundred and fifty years. The only common element of all those forms was propagandism. Were not the voyages of Columbus propagandist expeditions under the auspices of the Pope of Rome? Was not the wide occupation of Spanish America a propagandism of the Catholic church? The settlement of Massachusetts by the Pilgrims; of the New Netherlands by the reformers of Holland; the later plantation of the Mohawk valley by the Palatines; the establishment of Pennsylvania by the Friends; the mission of the Moravians at Bethlehem, in the same state; the foundation of Maryland by Lord Baltimore and his colony of British catholics; the settlement of Jamestown by the Cavaliers and Churchmen of England; that of South Carolina by the Huguenots: Were not all these propagandist colonizations? Was not Texas settled by a colony of slaveholders, and California by companies of freemen?

Yet never before did any prince, king, emperor, or president, denounce such colonizations. Does any law of nature or nations forbid them? Does any public authority quarantine, on the ground of opinion, the ships which are continually pouring into the gates of New York whole religious societies, from Ireland, Wales, Germany, and Norway, with their pastors, and clerks, and choirs?

But the president charges that the propagandists entered Kansas with a design to "anticipate and force the determination of the slavery question within the territory" (in favor of freedom), forgetting, nevertheless, that he has only just before deplored a failure of his own to anticipate and force the determination of that question in favor of slavery, by a *coup de main*, in advance even of their departure from their homes in the Atlantic states and in Europe. He charges, moreover, that the propagandists designed to "prevent the free and natural action of the inhabitants in the intended organization of the territory," when, in fact, they were pursuing the only free and natural course to organize it by immigrating and becoming permanent inhabitants, citizens and electors of Kansas. Not one unlawful or turbulent act has been hitherto charged against any one of the propagandists of freedom. Mark, now, an extraordinary inconsistency of the president. On the 29th of June, 1854, only twenty-nine days after the opening of the territory, and before one of these emigrants had reached Kansas, or even Missouri, a propagandist association, but not of emigrants, named the Platte County Self-Defensive Association, assembled at Weston, on the western border of Missouri, in the interest of slavery; and it published, through the organ of the president of the United States at that place, a resolution, that "when called upon by any citizen of Kansas, its members would hold themselves in readiness to assist in removing any and all emigrants who should go there under the aid of northern emigrant societies." This association afterward often made good its atrocious threats, by violence against the property, peace and lives of unoffending citizens of Kansas. But the president of the United States, so far from denouncing it, does not even note its existence.

The majority of the committee on territories ingeniously elaborate the president's charge, and arraign Massachusetts, her Emigrant Aid Society, and her emigrants. What has Massachusetts done worthy of censure? Before the Kansas organic law was passed by congress, Massachusetts, on application, granted to some of her citizens,

who were engaged in "taking up" new lands in western regions, one of those common charters which are used by all associations—industrial, moral, social, scientific and religious—now-a-days, instead of copartnerships, for the more convenient transaction of their fiscal affairs. The actual capital is some sixty thousand dollars. Neither the granting of the charter, nor any legislative action of the association under it, was morally wrong. To emigrate from one state or territory singly, or in company with others, with or without incorporation by statute, is a right of every citizen of the United States, as it is a right of every freeman in the world. The state that denies this right is a tyranny—the subject to whom it is denied is a slave. Such free emigration is the chief element of American progress and civilization. Without it, there could be no community, no political territory, no state in Kansas. Without it, there could have been no United States of America. To retain and carry into Kansas cherished political, as well as moral, social, and religious convictions, is a right of every emigrant. Must emigrants to that territory carry there only their persons, and leave behind their minds and souls, disembodied and wandering in their native lands? They only are fit founders of a state who exercise independence of opinion; and it is to the exercise of that right that our new states, equally with all the older ones, owe their intelligence and vigor.

> "There are, who, distant from their native soil,
> Still for their own and country's glory toil;
> While some, fast rooted to their parent spot,
> In life are useless, and in death forgot."

It is not morally wrong for Massachusetts to aid her sons, by a charter, to do what in itself is innocent and commendable. The president and the majority of the committee maintain that such associations are in violation of national or at least of international laws. Here is the constitution of the United States, and here are the statutes at large, in ten volumes octavo. Let the president or his defenders point out the inhibition. They specify, particularly, that the action of the state violates a law of comity, which regulates the intercourse of independent states, and especially the intercourse between the members of the Federal Union. Here are Vattel and Burlamaqui. Let them point out in these pages this law of comity. There is no law of comity which forbids nations from permitting and encouraging emigration, on the ground of opinion. Moreover,

slavery is an outlaw under the law of nations. Still further, the constitution of the United States has expressly incorporated into itself all of the laws of comity, for regulating the intercourse between independent states, which it deems proper to adopt. Whatever is forbidden expressly by the constitution is unlawful. Whatever is not forbidden is lawful. The supposed law of comity is not incorporated into the constitution.

With the aid of the committee on territories, we discover that the emigrants from Massachusetts have violated the supposed national laws, not by any unlawful conduct of their own, but by provoking the unlawful and flagitious conduct of the invaders of Kansas.

"They passed through Missouri in large numbers, using violent language, and giving unmistakable indications of their hostility to the domestic institutions of that state," and thus "they created apprehensions that the object of the Emigrant Aid company was to *abolitionize* Kansas, as a means of prosecuting a relentless warfare upon the institution of slavery within the limits of Missouri, which apprehensions, increasing with the progress of events, ultimately became settled convictions of the people of western Missouri.

Missouri builds railroads, steamboats and wharves. It cannot be, therefore, that the mere "largeness of the numbers" of the eastern travelers offended or alarmed the borderers. I confess my surprise that the sojourners used violent language. It seems unlike them. I confess my greater surprise that the borderers were disturbed so deeply by mere words. It seems unlike them. Which of the domestic institutions of Missouri were those against which the travelers manifested determined hostility? Not certainly her manufactories, banks, railroads, churches and schools. All these are domestic institutions held in high respect by the men of Massachusetts, and just such ones as these emigrants are now establishing in Kansas. It was therefore African slavery alone, a peculiar domestic institution of Missouri, against which their hostility was directed. Waiving a suspicious want of proof of the unwise conduct charged against them, I submit that clearly they did not thereby endanger that peculiar institution in Missouri, for they passed directly through that state into Kansas. How, then, were the borderers provoked? The Missourians inferred, from the language and demeanor of the travelers, that they would *abolitionize* Kansas, and thereafter, by means of Kansas abolitionized, prosecute a relentless warfare against slavery in Missouri. Far-seeing statesmen are these Missouri bor-

derers, but less deliberate than far-sighted. Kansas was not to be abolitionized. It had never been otherwise than abolitionized. Abolitionzed Kansas would constitute no means for the prosecution of such a warfare. Missouri lies adjacent to abolitionized Iowa on the north, and to abolitionized Illinois on the east, yet neither of those states has ever been used for such designs. How could this fearful enemy prosecute a warfare against slavery in Missouri? Only by buying the plantations of her citizens at their own prices, and so qualifying themselves to speak their hostility through the ballot-boxes? Could apprehensions so absurd justify the invasion of Kansas? Are the people of Kansas to be disfranchised and trodden down by the president of the United States, in punishment for any extravagance of emigrants, in Missouri, on the way to that territory?

Such is the president's second defense, so far as it presents new matter in avoidance of the accusation of the new state of Kansas.

I proceed, in the third place, to establish the truth of the accusations. Of what sort must the proofs be? Manifestly only such as the circumstances of the case permit to exist. Not engrossed documents, authenticated by executive, judicial or legislative officers. The transactions occurred in an unorganized country. All the authorities subsequently established in the territory are implicated, all the complainants disfranchised. Only presumptive evidence, derived from the cotemporaneous statements and actions of the parties concerned, can be required.

Such presumptive evidence is derived from the nature and character of the president's defenses. Why did the president plead at all on the thirty-first of December last, when the new state of Kansas was yet unorganized, and could not appear here to prefer her accusations until the twenty-third of March? Why, if he must answer so prematurely, did he not plead a general and direct denial? If he must plead specially, why did he not set forth the facts, instead of withholding all actual information concerning the case? Why, since, instead of defending himself, he must implead his accuser, did he not state at least the ground on which that accuser claimed to justify the conduct of which he complained? Why did he threaten "to overcome and suppress" the people of Kansas as insurrectionists, if he did not mean to terrify them and to prevent their appearing here, or at least to prejudice their cause? Why did he mock them with a promise of protection thereafter against interference by citi-

zens of other states, if they should deport themselves peacefully and submissively to the territorial authorities, if no cause for apprehending such interference had already been given by previous invasion? Why did he labor to embarrass his accuser by identifying her cause with the subject of abolition of slavery, and stigmatize her supporters with opprobrious epithets, and impute to them depraved and seditious motives? Why did he interpose the false and impertinent issue, whether one state could intervene by its laws or by force to abolish slavery in another state? Why did he distort the constitution, and present it as expressly guarantying the perpetuity of slavery? Why did he arraign so unnecessarily and so unjustly, not one, but all of the original northern states? Why did he drag into this case, where only Kansas is concerned, a studied, partial and prejudicial history of the past enlargements of the national domain, and of the past contests between the slave states and the free states in their rivalry for the balance of power?

Why did not the president rest content with one such attack on the character and conduct of the new state of Kansas, in anticipating her coming, if he felt assured that she really had no merit on which to stand? Why did he submit a second plea in advance? Why in this plea does he deplore the delays which prevented the Missouri borderers from effecting the conquest of Kansas, and the establishment of slavery therein, at the time of the congressional election held in November, 1854, in fraud of the Kansas law and of justice and humanity? Why, without reason or authority of public or of national law, does he denounce Massachusetts, her emigrant aid society and her emigrants? If "propagandist" emigrations must be denounced, why does he spare the Platte County Self-Defensive Association? Why does he charge Governor Reeder with "failing to put forth all his energies to prevent or counteract the tendencies to illegality which are found to exist in all imperfectly organized and newly associated countries," if, indeed, no "illegality" has occurred there? While thus, by implication, admitting that such illegality has occurred in Kansas, why does he not tell us its nature and extent? Why, when Governor Reeder was implicated in personal conduct, not criminal, but incongruous with his official relations, did the president retain him in office until after he had proclaimed at Easton that Kansas had been subjugated by the borderers of Missouri, and why, after he had done so, and had denounced the legis-

lature, did the president remove him for the same preëxisting cause only? Why does the president admit that the election for the legislative bodies of Kansas was held under circumstances inauspicious to a truthful and legal result, if, nevertheless, the result attained was indeed a truthful and legal one? On what evidence does the president ground his statement, that, after that election, there were *mutual* complaints of usurpation, fraud and violence, when we hear from no other quarter of such complaints made by the party that prevailed? If there were such mutual accusations, and even if they rested on probable grounds, would that fact abate the right of the people of Kansas to a government of their own, securing a safe and well ordered freedom? Why does the president argue that the governor [Mr. REEDER] alone had the power to receive and consider the returns of the election of the legislative bodies, and that he certified those returns in fifteen out of the twenty-two districts, when he knows that the governor, being his own agent, gave the certificates, on the ground that the returns were technically correct, and that the illegality complained of was in the conduct of the elections, and in the making up of the returns by the judges, and that the terror of the armed invasion prevented all complaints of this kind from being presented to the governor? Why does the president repose on the fact that the governor, on the ground of informality in the returns, rejected the members who were chosen in the seven other districts, and ordered new elections therein, and certified in favor of the persons then chosen, when he knows that the majority, elected in the fifteen districts, expelled at once the persons chosen at such second elections, and admitted those originally returned as elected in these seven districts, on the ground that the governor's rejection of them, and the second elections which he ordered, were unauthorized and illegal? Why does the president, although omitting to mention this last fact, nevertheless justify the expulsion of these newly elected members, on the ground that it was authorized by parliamentary law, when he knows that there was no parliamentary or other law existing in the territory, but the organic act of congress, which conferred no such power on the legislature? Why was Governor Reeder replaced by Mr. Shannon, who immediately proclaimed that the legislative bodies which his predecessor had denounced, were the legitimate legislature of the territory? Why does the president plead that the subject of the alleged Missourian usurpation and

tyranny in Kansas, was one which, by its nature, appertained exclusively to the jurisdiction of the local authorities of the territory, when, if the charges were true, there were no legitimate local authorities within the territory? Is a foreign usurpation in a defenseless territory of the United States to be tolerated, if only it be successful? And is the government *de facto*, by whomsoever usurped, and with whatever tyranny exercised, entitled to demand obedience from the people, and to be recognized by the president of the United States? Why does he plead that "whatever irregularities may have occurred, it is now too late to raise the question?" Is there nothing left but endurance to citizens of the United States, constituting a whole political community of men, women and children—an incipient American state—subjugated and oppressed? Must they sit down in peace, abandoned, contented and despised? Why does he plead that "at least it is a question as to which, neither now nor at any previous time, has the least possible legal authority been possessed by the president of the United States?" Did any magistrate ever before make such an exhibition of ambitious imbecility? Cannot congress clothe him with power to act, and is it not his duty to ask power to remove usurpation and subvert tyranny in a territory of the United States? Are these the tone, the tenor, and the staple of a defense, where the accused is guiltless aad the crimes charged were never committed. The president virtually confesses all the transactions charged, by thus presenting a connected system of maxims and principles, invented to justify them.

I proceed, however, to clinch conviction by direct and positive proofs: First, the statements of the party which has been overborne. General Pomeroy and his associates, in behalf of the state of Kansas, make this representation concerning the congressional election held in the territory on the 30th November, 1854:

"The first ballot-box that was opened upon our virgin soil, was closed to us by overpowering numbers and impending force. So bold and reckless were our invaders, that they cared not to conceal their attack. They came upon us, not in the guise of voters to steal away our franchise, but boldly and openly to snatch it with a strong hand. They came directly from their own homes, and in compact and organized bands, with arms in hand and provisions for the expedition, marched to our polls, and, when their work was done, returned whence they came. It is unnecessary to enter into the details; it is enough to say that in three districts in which, by the most irrefragable evidence, there were not one hundred and fifty voters, most of whom refused to participate in the mockery of the elective franchise, these invaders polled over a thousand votes.

In regard to the election of the 30th of March, 1855, the same party states:

"They (the Missourians) arrived at their several destinations the night before the election, and, having pitched their camps and placed their sentries, waited for the coming day. Baggage wagons were there, with arms and ammunition enough for a protracted fight, and among them two brass field pieces, ready charged. They came with drums beating and flags flying, and their leaders were of the most prominent and conspicuous men of their respective states. In the morning they surrounded the polls, armed with guns, bowie-knives and revolvers, and declared their determination to vote at all hazards and in spite of all consequences. If the judges could be made to subserve their purposes and receive their votes and if no obstacle was cast in their way, their leaders exerted themselves to preserve peace and order in the conduct of the election, but at the same time did not hesitate to declare, that if not allowed to vote, they would proceed to any extremity in destruction of property and life. If the control of the polls could not be had otherwise, the judges were by intimidation, and, if necessary, by violence, prevented from performing their duty, or, if unyielding in this respect, were driven from their post, and the vacancy filled in form by the persons on the ground; and whenever by any means they had obtained the control of the board, the foreign vote was promiscuously poured in, without discrimination or reserve, or the slightest care to conceal its nefarious illegality. At one of the polls, two of the judges having manfully stood up in the face of the armed mob, and declared they would do their duty, one portion of the mob commenced to tear down the house, another proceeded to break in the door of the judges' room, whilst others, with drawn knives, posted themselves at the window, with the proclaimed purpose of killing any voter who would allow himself to be sworn. Voters were dragged from the window, because they would not show their tickets, or vote at the dictation of the mob; and the invaders declared openly at the polls that they would cut the throats of the judges if they did not receive their votes without requiring an oath as to their residence. The room was finally forced, and the judges, surrounded by an armed and excited crowd, were offered the alternative of resignation or death, and five minutes were allowed for their decision. The ballot-box was seized, and, amid shouts of 'hurrah for Missouri,' was carried into the mob. The two menaced judges then left the ground, together with all the resident citizens, except a few who acted in the outrage, because the result expected from it corresponded to their own views.

"When an excess of the foreign force was found to be had at one poll, detachments were sent to the others. * * * * A minister of the gospel, who refused to accede to the demands of a similar mob of some four hundred armed and organized men, was driven by violence from his post, and the vacancy filled by themselves. * * * * Another clergyman, for the expression of his opinion, was assaulted and beaten. * * * * The inhabitants of the district, powerless to resist the abundant supply of arms and ammunition, organized preparation, and overwhelming numbers of the foreigners left the polls without voting. * * * In the Lawrence district, one voter was fired at, as he was driven from the election ground. * * * Finding they had a greater force than was necessary for that poll, some two hundred men were drafted from that

number, and sent off under the proper officers to another district, after which they still polled from this camp seven hundred votes. * * * In the fourth and seventh districts, the invaders came together in an armed and organized body, with trains of fifty wagons, besides horsemen, and, the night before election, pitched their camps in the vicinity of the polls, and having appointed their own judges, in place of those who, from intimidation or otherwise, failed to attend, they voted without any proof of residence. In these two election districts, where the census shows one hundred voters, there were polled three hundred and fourteen votes, and last fall seven hundred and sixty-five votes, although a large part of the actual residents did not vote on either occasion. * * * * * From a careful examination of the returns, we are satisfied that over three thousand votes were thus cast by the citizens and residents of the states."

I place in opposition to these statements of the party that was overborne, the statements of the party that prevailed, beginning with signals of the attack, and ending with celebrations of the victory.

General Stringfellow addressed the invaders in Missouri, on the eve of the election of March 30, 1855, thus:

"To those who have qualms of conscience as to violating laws, state or national, the time has come when such impositions must be disregarded, as your rights and property are in danger; and I advise you, one and all, to enter every election district in Kansas, in defiance of Reeder and his vile myrmidons, and vote at the point of the bowie-knife and revolver. Neither give nor take quarter, as our cause demands it. It is enough that the slaveholding interest wills it, from which there is no appeal. What right has Governor Reeder to rule Missourians in Kansas? His proclamation and prescribed oath must be repudiated. It is your interest to do so. Mind that slavery is established where it is not prohibited."

The Kansas Herald, an organ of both the administration and the pro-slavery party, announced the result of the legislative election in the territory immediately afterwards, as follows:

"Yesterday was a proud and glorious day for the friends of southern rights. The triumph of the pro-slavery party is complete and overwhelming. Come on, southern men! Bring your slaves, and fill up the territory! Kansas is saved!"

The Squatter Sovereign, published in Missouri, thus announced the result of the election the day after it closed:

"INDEPENDENCE, March 31, 1855.

"Several hundred emigrants from Kansas have just entered our city. They were preceded by the Westport and Independence brass bands. They came in at the west side of the public square, and proceeded entirely around it, the bands cheering us with fine music, and the emigrants with good news. Immediately

following the bands were about two hundred horsemen in regular order; following these were one hundred and fifty wagons, carriages, &c. They gave repeated cheers for Kansas and Missouri. They report that not an anti-slavery man will be in the legislature of Kansas. We have made a clean sweep."

A letter written at Brunswick, in Missouri, dated April 20th, 1855, and published in the New York Herald, a pro-slavery journal, says:

"From five to seven thousand men started from Missouri to attend the election, some to remove, but the most to return to their families, with an intention, if they liked the territory, to make it their permanent abode, at the earliest moment practicable. But they intended to vote. The Missourians were, many of them, Douglas men. There were one hundred and fifty voters from this county, one hundred and seventy-five from Howard, one hundred from Cooper. Indeed, every county furnished its quota; and when they set out it looked like an army. * * They were armed. * * * And, as there were no houses in the territory, they carried tents. Their mission was a peaceable one—to vote, and to drive down stakes for their future homes. After the election, some one thousand five hundred of the voters sent a committee to Mr. Reeder, to ascertain if it was his purpose to ratify the election. He answered that it was, and said the majority at an election must carry the day. But it is not to be denied that the one thousand five hundred, apprehending that the governor might attempt to play the tyrant—since his conduct had already been insidious and unjust—wore on their hats bunches of hemp. They were resolved, if a tyrant attempted to trample upon the rights of the sovereign people, to hang him."

On the 29th of May, 1855, the Squatter Sovereign, an organ of the invasion in Missouri, thus gave utterance to its spirit:

"From reports now received of Reeder, he never intends returning to our borders. Should he do so, we, without hesitation, say that our people ought to hang him by the neck, like a traitorous dog as he is, so soon as he puts his unhallowed feet upon our shores. Vindicate your characters and the territory; and, should the ungrateful dog dare to come among us again, hang him to the first rotten tree. A military force to protect the ballot-box! Let President Pierce or Governor Reeder, or any other power, attempt such a course, in this or any portion of the Union, and that day will never be forgotten."

Governor Reeder, at Easton, in Pennsylvania, on his first return to that place after the elections, declared the same result in frank and candid words, which cost him his office, namely:

"It was indeed too true that Kansas had been invaded, conquered, subjugated, by an armed force from beyond her borders, led on by a fanatical spirit, trampling under foot the principles of the Kansas bill and the right of suffrage."

David R. Atchison, a direct and out-spoken man, who never shrinks from responsibility, and who is confessedly eminent at once

as a political leader in Missouri, and as a leader of the pro-slavery movement therein directed against Kansas, in a speech reported as having been made to his fellow citizens, and which, so far as I know, has not been disavowed, said:

"I saw it with my own eyes. These men came with the avowed purpose of driving or expelling you from the territory. What did I advise you to do? Why, meet them at their own game. When the first election came off, I told you to go over and vote. You did so, and beat them. We, our party in Kansas, nominated General Whitfield. They, the abolitionists, nominated Flenniken; not Flanegan, for Flanegan was a good, honest man, but *Flenniken*. Well, the next day after the election, that same Flenniken, with three hundred of his voters, left the territory, and has never returned—no, never returned! Well, what next? Why, an election for members of the legislature, to organize the territory, must be held. What did I advise you to do then? Why, meet them on their own ground, and beat them at their own game again; and, cold and inclement as the weather was, I went over with a company of men. My object in going was not to vote; I had not a right to vote, unless I had disfranchised myself in Missouri. I was not within two miles of a voting place. My object in going was not to vote, but to settle a difficulty between two of our candidates; and abolitionists of the north said and published it abroad that Atchison was there with bowie-knife and revolver, and by God 'twas true. I never did go into that territory, I never intended to go into that territory, without being prepared for all such kind of cattle. Well, we beat them; and Governor Reeder gave certificates to a majority of all the members of both houses; and then, after they were organized, as everybody will admit, they were the only competent persons to say who were and who were not members of the same."

A tree is known by its fruits. If Missourians voted in Kansas, it would be expected that the ballots deposited would exceed the number of electors. Just so it was. We have seen that it was so asserted. The executive journal, recently obtained, proves that in four districts, where the results were not contested, two thousand nine hundred and sixty-four votes were cast on the 30th of March, although only one thousand three hundred and sixty-five voters were there, as ascertained by the census. Again: The legislature, chosen on the 30th of March, 1855, withdrew from the interior of the territory to a place inconvenient to its citizens, and on the border of Missouri. There that legislature enacted laws to this effect, namely: Forbidding the speaking, writing, or printing, or publishing of anything, in any form, calculated to disaffect slaves, or induce them to escape, under pain of not less than five years' imprisonment with hard labor; and forbidding free persons from maintaining by speech, writing, or printing, or publishing, that slaves cannot

lawfully be held in the territory, under pain of imprisonment and hard labor two years.

The legislature further enacted, that no persons "conscientiously opposed to holding slaves," or entertaining doubts of the legal existence of slavery in Kansas, shall sit as a juror in the trial of any cause founded on a breach of the laws which I have described. They further provided, that all officers and attorneys should be sworn, not only to support the constitution of the United States, but also to support and sustain the *organic law of the territory*, and the *fugitive slave law;* and that any persons offering to vote shall be *presumed* to be entitled to vote until the contrary is shown; and if any one, when required, shall refuse to take an oath to sustain the fugitive slave law, he shall not be permitted to vote. Although they passed a law that none but an inhabitant who had paid a tax should vote, yet they made no *time* of *residence* necessary, and provided for the immediate payment of a poll tax; so virtually declaring that on the eve of an election the people of a neighboring state can come in, in unlimited numbers, and by taking up a residence of a day or an hour, pay a poll tax, and thus become legal voters, and then, after voting, return to their own state. They thus, in practical effect, provided for the people of Missouri to control future elections at their pleasure, and permitted such only of the real inhabitants of the territory to vote as are friendly to the holding of slaves.

They permitted no election of any of the officers in the territory to be made by the people thereof, but created the offices, and filled them, or appointed officers to fill them, for long periods. They provided that the next annual election should be held in October, 1856, and the assembly should meet in January, 1857; so that none of these laws could be changed until the lower house might be changed, in 1856; but the council, which is elected for two years, could not be changed so as to allow a change of the laws or officers until the session of 1858, however much the inhabitants of the territory might desire it. How forcibly do these laws illustrate that old political maxim of the English nation, that a parliament called by a conqueror is itself conquered and enslaved! Who but foreigners, usurpers, and tyrants, could have made for the people of Kansas —a people "perfectly free"—such laws as these. Anatomists will describe the instrument, and even the force of the blow, if only you show them the wound.

Behold the proofs on which the allegations of invasion, usurpation, and tyranny, made by the new state of Kansas, rest. They are: First. The president's own virtual admission, by defenses indirect, irrelevant, ill-tempered, sophistical, and evasive. Second. An absolute agreement, concurrence, and harmony, between the statements of the conflicting parties who were engaged in the transactions involved. Third. The consequences of those transactions exactly such as must follow, if the accusations be true, and such as could not result if they be false. A few words, however, must be added, to bring more distinctly into view the president's complicity in these transactions, and to establish his responsibility therefor. The president openly lent his official influence and patronage to the slaveholders of Missouri, to effect the abrogation of the prohibition of slavery in Kansas, contained in the act of congress of 1820. He knew their purposes in regard to the elections in Kansas. He never interfered to prevent, to defeat, or to hinder them. He employed his official patronage to aid them. He now defends and protects the usurpation and tyranny, established by the invaders in Kansas, with all the influence of his exalted station, and even with the military power of the republic; and he argues the duty of the people there to submit to the forcible establishment of slavery, in violation of the national pledge, which he concurred in giving, that they should be left perfectly free to reject and exclude that justly obnoxious system. It thus appears that the president of the United States holds the people of Kansas prostrated and enslaved at his feet.

To complete the painful account of this great crime, it is necessary now to add that there has not been one day nor night, since the government of Kansas was constituted and confided to the president of the United States, in which either the properties or the liberties, or even the lives, of its citizens have been secure against the violence and vengeance of the extreme foreign faction which he upholds and protects. At this day, Kansas is becoming more distinctly than before, the scene of a conflict of irreconcilable opinions, to be determined by brute force. No immigrant goes there unarmed, no citizen dwells there in safety unarmed; armed masses of men are proceeding into the territory, from various parts of the United States, to complete the work of invasion and tyranny which he has thus begun, under circumstances of fraud and perfidy unworthy of the character of a ruler of a free people. This gathering conflict in

Kansas divides the sympathies, interests, passions, and prejudices, of the people of the United States. Whether, under such circumstances, it can be circumscribed within the limits of the territory of Kansas, must be determined by statesmen, from their knowledge of the courses of civil commotions, which have involved questions of moral right and conscientious duty, as well as balances of political power. Whether, on the other hand, the people of Kansas, under these circumstances, will submit to this tyranny of a citizen of the United States like themselves, whose term of political power is nearly expired, can be determined by considering it in the aspect in which it is viewed by themselves. Speechless here, as they yet are, I give utterance to their united voices, and, holding in my hand the arraignment of George III, by the congress of 1776, I impeach —in the words of that immortal text—the president of the United States:

"He has refused to pass laws for the accommodation of the people unless they would relinquish the right of representation in their legislature—a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only;

"He has called together legislative bodies at a place unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures;

"He has prevented legislative houses from being elected, for no other cause than his conviction that they "would oppose with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people;

"He has refused for a long time, after" spurious legislative houses were imposed by himself, by usurpation, on the people of Kansas, "to cause others to be elected, whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large, for their exercise, the state remaining in the meantime exposed to all the danger of invasion from without, and civil war within;

"He has created a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers, to harass the people, and eat out their substance;

"He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, to compel our submission to a foreign" legislature, "and has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power;

"He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation;

"For protecting" invaders of Kansas "from punishment for any murders which they shall commit on the inhabitants" of this territory;

"For abolishing the free system of American law in" this territory, "establishing therein an arbitrary government, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into" other territories;

"For taking away our charter, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the powers of our government;

"For suspending our own legislature, and declaring" an usurping legislature, constituted by himself, "invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever."

What is wanting here to fill up the complement of a high judicial process? Is it an accuser? The youngest born of the republic is before you, imploring you to rescue her from immolation on the altar of public faction. Is it a crime? Bethink yourselves what it is that has been subverted. It is the whole of a complete and rounded-off republican government of a territory indeed, by name, but, in substance, a civil state. Consider the effect. The people of Kansas *were* "perfectly free." They now *are* free only to submit and obey. Consider whose system that republican government was, and the power that established it. It was one of the constitutions of the United States, established by an act of the congress of the United States. Consider what a tyranny it is that has been built on that atrocious usurpation. It is not a discriminating tyranny, that selects and punishes one, or a few, or even many, but it disfranchises all, and reduces every citizen to abject slavery. Examine the code created by the legislature. All the statutes of the state of Missouri are enacted in gross, without alteration or amendment, for the government of Kansas; and then, at the end, the hasty blunder of misnomer is corrected by an explanatory act, that wherever the word "state" occurs, it means "territory." And what a code! One that stifles not, indeed, the fruits of the womb, but the equally important element of a state, the fruits—the immortal fruits—of the mind—a code that puts in peril all rights and liberties whatsoever, by denying to men the right to know, to utter, and to argue, freely, according to conscience—a right in itself conservative of all other rights and liberties. Is an offender wanting? He stands before you, in many respects the most eminent man in all the world—the president of the United States—the constitutional and chosen defender and protector of the people who have been subjugated and enslaved. Is there anything of dignity or authority wanting to this tribunal? Where elsewhere shall be found one more august than the senate of the United States? It is the ancient, constant, and undoubted right and usage of parliaments—it is the chief purpose of their being—to question and complain of all persons, of what degree soever, found grievous to the commonwealth, in abusing the power and trust committed to them by the people. Does this tri-

bunal need a motive? We have that, too, in painful reality. These usurpations and oppressions have hitherto rested with the president of the United States, and those whom he has abetted. If they shall be left unredressed, they will henceforth become, by adoption, our own.

The conviction of the offending president is complete, and now he sinks out of view. His punishment rests with the people of the United States, whose trust he has betrayed. His conviction was only incidental to the business which is the order of the day. The order of the day is the redress of the wrongs of Kansas.

How like unto each other are the parallels of tyranny and revolution in all countries and in all times! Kansas is to-day in the very act of revolution against a tyranny of the president of the United States, identical in all its prominent features with that tyranny of the king of England which gave birth to the American revolution. Kansas has instituted a revolution, simply because ordinary remedies can never be applied in great political emergencies. There is a profound philosophy that belongs to revolutions. According to that philosophy, the president is assumed by the people of Kansas to entertain a resentment which can never be appeased, and his power, consequently, must be wholly taken away. Happily, however, for Kansas and for us, her revolution is one that was anticipated and sanctioned and provided for in the constitution of the United States, and is therefore a peaceful and (paradoxical as the expression may seem) a constitutional one. Never before have I seen occasion so great for admiring the wisdom and forecast of those who raised that noble edifice of civil government. The people of Kansas, deprived of their sovereignty by a domestic tyranny, have nevertheless lawfully rescued it provisionally, and, so exercising it, have constituted themselves a state, and applied to congress to admit them as such into the federal Union. Congress has power to admit the new state thus organized. The favorable exercise of that power will terminate and crown the revolution. Once a state, the people of Kansas can preserve internal order, and defend themselves against invasion. Thus, the constitutional remedy is as effectual as it is peaceful and simple.

This is the remedy for the evils existing in the territory of Kansas, which I propose. Happily there is no need to prove it to be either a lawful one or a proper one, or the only possible one. The president of the United States and the committee on territories unani-

mously concede all this broad ground, because he recommends it, and they adopt it.

Wherein, then, do I differ from them? Simply thus. I propose to apply the remedy now, by admitting the new state with its present population and present constitution. My opponents insist on postponing the measure until the territory shall be conceded by the usurping authorities to contain ninety-three thousand seven hundred inhabitants, and until those authorities shall direct and authorize the people to organize a new state under a new constitution. In other words, I propose to allow the people of Kansas to apply the constitutional remedy at once. The president proposes to defer it indefinitely, and to commit the entire application of it to the hands of the Missouri borderers. He confesses the inadequacy of that course by asking appropriations of money to enable him to maintain and preserve order within the territory until the indefinite period when the constitutional remedy shall be applied. There is no sufficient reason for the delay which the president advises. He admits the rightfulness and necessity of the remedy. It is as rightful and necessary now as it ever will be. It is demanded by the condition and circumstances of the people of Kansas now. You cannot justly postpone, any more than you can justly deny that right. To postpone would be a denial. The president will need no grant of money or of armed men to enforce obedience to law, when you shall have redressed the wrongs of which the people complain. Even under governments less free than our own, there is no need of power where justice holds the helm. When justice is impartially administered, the obedience of the subject or citizen will be voluntary, cheerful and practically unlimited.

Freedom justly due cannot be conceded too soon. True freedom exists, the utmost bounds of civil liberty are obtained, only where complaints are freely heard, deeply considered and speedily redressed. So only can you restore to Kansas the perfect freedom which you pledged and she has lost.

The constitution does not prescribe ninety-three thousand seven hundred, or any other number of people, as necessary to constitute a state. Besides, under the present ratio of increase, Kansas, whose population now is forty thousand, will number one hundred thousand in a few months. The point made concerning numbers, is therefore practically unimportant and frivolous. The president

objects that the past proceedings, by which the new state of Kansas was organized, were irregular in three respects: First, that they were instituted, conducted and completed without a previous permission by congress or by the local authorities within the territory. Secondly, that they were instituted, conducted and completed by a party and not by the whole people of Kansas. And thirdly, that the new state holds an attitude of defiance and insubordination toward the territorial authorities and the Federal Union. I reply, first, that if the proceedings in question were irregular and partisanlike and factious, the exigencies of the case would at least excuse the faults, and congress has unlimited discretion to waive them. Secondly, the proceedings were not thus irregular, partisanlike and factious, because no act of congress forbade them—no act of the territorial legislature forbade them, directly or by implication—nor had the territorial legislature power either to authorize or to prohibit them. The proceedings were, indeed, instituted by a party who favored them. But they were prosecuted and consummated in the customary forms of popular elections, which were open to all the inhabitants of the territory qualified to vote by the organic law, and to no others; and they have in no case come into conflict, nor does the new state now act or assume to engage in conflict with either the territorial authorities or the government of the Union. Thirdly, there can be no irregularity where there is no law prescribing what shall be regular. Congress has passed no law establishing regulations for the organization or admission of new states. Precedents in such cases, being without foundation in law, are without authority. This is a country whose government is regulated, not by precedents, but by constitutions. But if precedents were necessary, they are found in the cases of Texas and California, each of which was organized and admitted, subject to the same alleged irregularities.

The majority of the committee on territories, in behalf of the president, interpose one further objection, by tracing this new state organization to the influence of a secret, armed, political society. Secrecy and combination, with extra-judicial oaths and armed power, were the enginery of the Missouri borderers in effecting the subjugation of the people of Kansas, as that machinery is always employed in the commission of political crimes. How far it was lawful or morally right for the people of Kansas to employ the same agencies for the defense of their lives and liberties, may be a question for

casuists, but certainly is not one for me. I can freely confess, however, my deep regret that secret societies, for any purpose whatsoever, have obtained a place among political organizations within the republic; and it is my hope that the experience which we have now so distinctly had, that they can be but too easily adapted to unlawful, seditious and dangerous enterprises, while they bring down suspicion and censure on high and noble causes when identified with them, may be sufficient to induce a general discontinuance of them.

Will the senate hesitate even an hour between the alternatives before them? The passions of the American people find healthful exercise in peaceful colonizations, and the construction of railroads, and the building up and multiplying of republican institutions. The territory of Kansas lies across the path through which railroads must be built, and along which such institutions must be founded, without delay, in order to preserve the integrity of our empire. Shall we suppress enterprises so benevolent and so healthful, and inflame our country with that fever of intestine war which exhausts and consumes not more the wealth and strength than the virtue and freedom of a nation? Shall we confess that the proclamation of popular sovereignty within the territory of Kansas, was not merely a failure, but was a pretense and a fraud? Or will senators now contend that the people of Kansas, destitute as they are of a legislature of their own, of executive authorities of their own, of judicial authorities of their own, of a militia of their own, of revenues of their own, subject to disposal by themselves, practically deprived as they are of the rights of voting, serving as jurors, and of writing, printing and speaking their own opinions, are nevertheless in the enjoyment and exercise of popular sovereignty? Shall we confess before the world, after so brief a trial, that this great political system of ours is inadequate either to enable the majority to control through the operation of opinion, without force, or to give security to the citizen against tyranny and domestic violence? Are we prepared so soon to relinquish our simple and beautiful systems of republican government, and to substitute in their place the machinery of usurpation and despotism?

The congress of the United States can refuse admission to Kansas only on the ground that it will not relinquish the hope of carrying African slavery into that new territory. If you are prepared to assume that ground, why not do it manfully and consistently, and

establish slavery there by a direct and explicit act of congress? But have we come to that stage of demoralization and degeneracy so soon? We, who commenced our political existence and gained the sympathies of the world by proclaiming to other nations that we held "these truths to be self-evident: That all men are born equal, and have certain inalienable rights; and that among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness:" we, who in the spirit of that declaration have assumed to teach and to illustrate, for the benefit of mankind, a higher and better civilization than they have hitherto known! If the congress of the United States shall persist in this attempt, then they shall at least allow me to predict its results. Either you will not establish African slavery in Kansas, or you will do it at the cost of the sacrifice of all the existing liberties of the American people. Even if slavery were, what it is not, a boon to the people of Kansas, they would reject it if enforced upon their acceptance by federal bayonets. The attempt is in conflict with all the tendencies of the age. African slavery has, for the last fifty years, been giving way, as well in this country as in the islands and on the mainland throughout this hemisphere. The political power and prestige of slavery in the United States are passing away. The slave states practically governed the Union directly for fifty years. They govern it now, only indirectly, through the agency of northern hands, temporarily enlisted in their support. So much, owing to the decline of their power, they have already conceded to the free states. The next step, if they persist in their present course, will be the resumption and exercise by the free states of the control of the government, without such concessions as they have hitherto made to obtain it. Throughout a period of nearly twenty years, the defenders of slavery screened it from discussion in the national councils. Now, they practically confess to the necessity for defending it here, by initiating discussion themselves. They have at once thrown away their most successful weapon, compromise, and worn out that one which was next in effectiveness, threats of secession from the Union. It is under such unpropitious circumstances that they begin the new experiment of extending slavery into free territory by force, the armed power of the federal government. You will need many votes from free states in the house of representatives, and even some votes from those states in this house, to send an army with a retinue of slaves in its train into Kansas. Have you counted up your votes in the two

houses? Have you calculated how long those who shall cast such votes will retain their places in the national legislature?

But I will grant, for the sake of the argument, that with federal battalions you can carry slavery into Kansas, and maintain it there. Are you quite confident that this republican form of government can then be upheld and preserved? You will then yourselves have introduced the Trojan horse. No republican government ever has endured with standing armies maintained in its bosom to enforce submission to its laws. A people who have once learned to relinquish their rights, under compulsion, will not be long in forgetting that they ever had any. In extending slavery into Kansas, therefore, by arms, you will subvert the liberties of the people.

Senators of the free states, I appeal to you. Believe ye the prophets? I know you do. You know, then, that slavery neither works mines and quarries, nor founds cities, nor builds ships, nor levies armies, nor mans navies. Why, then, will you insist on closing up this new territory of Kansas against all enriching streams of immigration, while you pour into it the turbid and poisonous waters of African slavery? Which one of you all, whether of Connecticut, or of Pennsylvania, or of Illinois, or of Michigan, would consent thus to extinguish the chief light of civilization within the state in which your own fortunes are cast, and in which your own posterity are to live? Why will you pursue a policy so unkind, so ungenerous, and so unjust, toward the helpless, defenseless, struggling territory of Kansas, inhabited as it is by your own brethren, depending on you for protection and safety? Will slavery in Kansas add to the wealth or power of your own states, or to the wealth, power or glory of the republic? You know that it will diminish all of these. You profess a desire to end this national debate about slavery, which has become for you intolerable. Is it not time to relinquish that hope? You have exhausted the virtue for that purpose, that resided in compacts and platforms, in the suppression of the right of petition and in arbitrary parliamentary laws, and in abnegation of federal authority over the subject of slavery within the national territories. Will you even then end the debate, by binding Kansas with chains, for the safety of slavery in Missouri? Even then you must give over Utah to slavery, to make it secure and permanent in Kansas; and you must give over Oregon and Washington to both polygamy and slavery, so as to guaranty equally the one and the other of those

peculiar domestic institutions in Utah; and so you must go on, sacrificing on the shrine of peace territory after territory, until the prevailing nationality of freedom and of virtue shall be lost, and the vicious anomalies, which you have hitherto vainly hoped Almighty Wisdom would remove from among you without your own concurrence, shall become the controlling elements in the republic. He who found a river in his path, and sat down to wait for the flood to pass away, was not more unwise than he who expects the agitation of slavery to cease, while the love of freedom animates the bosoms of mankind.

The solemnity of the occasion draws over our heads that cloud of disunion which always arises whenever the subject of slavery is agitated. Still the debate goes on, more ardently, earnestly and angrily than ever before. It employs now not merely logic, reproach, menace, retort and defiance, but sabres, rifles and cannon. Do you look through this incipient war quite to the end, and see there peace, quiet and harmony on the subject of slavery? If so, pray enlighten me, and show me how long the way is which leads to that repose. The free states are loyal, and they always will remain so. Their foothold on this continent is firm and sure. Their ability to maintain themselves, unaided, under the present constitution, is established. The slave states, also, have been loyal hitherto, and I hope and trust they ever may remain so. But if disunion could ever come, it would come in the form of a secession of the slaveholding states; and it would come, then, when the slaveholding power, which is already firmly established on the gulf of Mexico, and extends a thousand miles northward along both banks of the Mississippi, should have fastened its grappling irons upon the fountains of the Missouri and the slopes of the Rocky mountains. Then that power would either be intolerably supreme in this republic, or it would strike for independence or exclusive domination. Then the free states and slave states of the Atlantic, divided and warring with each other, would disgust the free states of the Pacific, and they would have abundant cause and justification for withdrawing from a Union productive no longer of peace, safety and liberty to themselves, and no longer holding up the cherished hopes of mankind.

The continental congress of 1787, on resigning the trust which it had discharged with signal fidelity, into the hands of the authorities elected under the new constitution, and in taking leave of their

constituents, addressed to the people of the United States this memorable injunction: "Let it never be forgotten, that the cause of the United States has always been the cause of human nature." Let us recall that precious monition; let us examine the ways which we have pursued hitherto, under the light thrown upon them by that instruction. We shall find, in doing so, that we have forgotten moral right in the pursuit of material greatness, and we shall cease henceforth from practising upon ourselves the miserable delusion that we can safely extend empire, when we shall have become reckless of the obligations of eternal justice, and faithless to the interests of universal freedom.

KANSAS—USURPATIONS.[1]

I SHALL, with the greatest pleasure in the world, vote for this amendment (Mr. WILSON'S, to abrogate the spurious laws of Kansas). I agree with the honorable mover of it, that the present bill has no other tendency, and can have no other effect, than to crown with success the object of the law of 1854, which abrogated the prohibition of slavery contained in the Missouri compromise act, and thus to form a slave state out of Kansas. Against that I was committed then; I commit myself now; I stand committed forever. I admit that the bill, as it would stand after the adoption of the amendment, would not leave in the territory of Kansas a code of municipal laws. But, in that shape, this bill, if passed, would be only a congressional declaration of what I hold to be a solemn political fact, already established and known, namely: that there is no law, there are no laws, there is no code, there is no legal society in Kansas, otherwise organized or governed, than by the organic act passed by congress in the year 1854.

I hold now, as I have already shown to the senate and to the country on a former occasion, that what is called the legislature of Kansas is a usurpation, and that the code which it has established is

[1] Speech in the Senate of the United States, July 2, 1856, against Mr. Douglas' second Enabling Bill, and in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas into the Union.

a tyranny. Lapse of time during our long debate has not changed their character. I hold that there is no legal obligation, as there is no moral obligation, upon any man, whether he is a citizen of that territory or otherwise, to treat that legislature or that code with the least respect. If the legislature be a usurpation, all men must admit this consequence to be just. When we had this subject in debate at an earlier stage of the session, with only confused and informal evidence before us, it was denied that the legislature of the territory is a usurpation. That fact is completely established now by the report of a committee appointed by the house of representatives, to investigate all the circumstances of the case, and they show beyond all manner of doubt, that no sooner had congress authorized the inhabitants of the territory of Kansas to constitute for themselves a civil government, in a prescribed form, than an armed body of invaders from the state of Missouri, and from other states and territories, took possession of the polls, drove away the voters, and holding the territory in fact under martial law, waged by seditious men, created and constituted this legislature of Kansas.

From this most unwarrantable proceeding has followed the imbroglio in which the county finds itself involved. The president, holding that he had no power to correct the evil—that he had no right to pronounce at all on this fact thus questioned—assumed that it was his duty to execute the laws of that legislature, while he very properly addressed himself to congress on the subject. Congress was appealed to; has had the subject under discussion three months; and the house of representatives, more wise, more just, more true to freedom, than the senate has been to the cause of civil government and civil and religious liberty, sent a commission to Kansas to ascertain the truth of the case involved. Their report has been made to the house of representatives; and it establishes, beyond denial, and even beyond all question, that there has been no legitimate election, no constitutional election, no legal election in the territory, and that there is, of course, no legislature, and there are no laws there.

It strikes me that, after being at sea for the last three months, this proposition of the honorable senator from Massachusetts is the very first one which seems to give us a hope of finding any land. It shows us a safe port. The proposition distinctly is to abrogate the pretended laws of that usurping and tyrannical legislature.

I do not say that simply this measure will give peace to Kansas; I do not say that nothing more will be necessary to give peace and rescue liberty in Kansas; but I do say that, so far as it goes, it would be an advance—the first one that would have been made towards either of those important objects during the last three months. I am prepared at once to give my support to it. When we shall have abolished that tyranny and its laws, we shall then be in a condition to see whether there is not something more which can be done.

Talk about that being a legislature and a government which can exact obedience from the people of Kansas! It has not the strength in itself to stand a day, nor an hour. It is upheld by the bayonets of the army of the United States. Talk about these being laws obligatory on the citizens of Kansas, when they were made by invaders from the state of Missouri! Talk about these pretended enactments as being laws which ought to be respected and obeyed—laws which disfranchise the legal profession, the first element of constitutional liberty in every government of the Saxon or Anglo-Saxon race! Talk about laws to be upheld which deprive persons accused of crime of trial by a fair and impartial jury, and which establish a test of opinion as qualifications not only for the exercise of the ballot, but also for the jury-box! Talk about these being laws which are obligatory, and are to be maintained for a day or even for an hour—enactments which deprive men of the liberty of speech! Talk about those being laws which are entitled to obedience anywhere under the constitution of the United States—laws under which the press, the palladium of civil and religious liberty, is indicted, tried, convicted, and suppressed as a nuisance. I beg honorable gentlemen to consider well the pass to which they have brought things in this country. They have brought the country to the verge of civil war. They propose now a compromise. The day for compromises is ended.

The honorable senator is glad of it, and so am I. We shall henceforth take our stand in all these questions upon the constitution of the United States, and those of us who get our feet truly on it will stand firm. Those who happen not to get that safe footing will find they may have a slippery and unsubstantial foothold.

The question, the honorable senator says, which is proposed by his bill, offers no compromise. I beg to correct the honorable gentleman. The original proposition was, that congress should be left

under the territorial government established by the Missouri legislature, that it should be left subject to all the statutes of that legislature, and that it should not be admitted in the Union until it should be able to number ninety-three thousand seven hundred people.

(Mr. BROWN—Ninety-three thousand four hundred and twenty.)

I stand corrected, and the correction reminds me of the careful accuracy of my honorable and excellent friend—now dead—[Mr. GIDEON LEE], who was a member of the house of representatives from the city of New York at the time the great fire occurred there. When an application was made for the remission of duties on account of the fire, an honorable member, in speaking in support of the application, said that yesterday morning the sun rose upon a city that was crowded and compact with the dwellings and warehouses of a great commercial city, and the sun of the same day set upon a city of which fifty acres were in ashes; my honorable friend [Mr. LEE] corrected the honorable member by saying fifty-two acres and a half.

But, whether it was ninety-three thousand four hundred and twenty, or ninety-three thousand seven hundred, the practical question was the same. It was the amount necessary in one of the states to entitle a district to a representative in congress. What have we to-day, sir? The proposition of the committee now is, that the Missouri legislature shall remain in force—so far the same; but that all laws passed by the legislature subversive of the freedom of speech—all laws subversive of a trial by jury—all laws subversive of citizenship, shall be abrogated; and finally that, without waiting for the ninety-three thousand, and that odd fraction, whatever it may be, that state shall be admitted now into the Union immediately upon the election of a convention, and the organization of a state constitution.

I beg my honorable friend from Georgia to consider whether this is not a compromise. I certainly understand that it is offered as such, and that it has been accepted as such, not by that portion of the senate among whom I belong, but by others who could not be prevailed upon to vote for the bill in the shape in which it was originally proposed.

I do not know that it is in my power to state a proposition which would commend itself in my judgment more thoroughly to the purpose of setthing the whole of this difficulty than the proposition of

the honorable senator from Massachusetts to abrogate the laws. I would have preferred that his amendment had gone further, and declared the territorial legislature itself to be illegal, and therefore abrogated it. When you shall have once done that, you will then have removed all of the existing grounds of contention. You will have then discharged all these prosecutions for constructive treason under which men, who have assembled according to the constitution, and according to the settled precedents and customs of the country to petition congress for redress, have been indicted and are held in close confinement to be tried for treason. You will then have abolished all those criminal proceedings in which editors, who have maintained the cause of justice and civil liberty in that territory, have been indicted, and are held in duress to be subjected to punishment in the penitentiary for maintaining (what is true, in my judgment) that slavery is not, and cannot go, into the territory of Kansas by virtue of the constitution or any existing law of the United States. Then you will have at last restored the people to the possession of their liberties, and it will then be time enough to see what we shall do to give them a well-digested system of civil government and municipal laws.

[Mr. Wilson's amendment having failed, Mr. Seward then addressed the senate on the bill enabling the people of Kansas to form a constitution, and apply for admission into the Union.]

The daily sessions of the senate usually last three or four hours. The present one has already reached its fourteenth hour. If I do not hasten the gleams of the morning sun will pale the lights of the chandelier before I shall have closed my speech.

The honorable and distinguished senator from Kentucky [Mr. CRITTENDEN] has appealed eloquently and earnestly to my love of peace, and to my devotion to the Union. Certainly, every consideration weighs upon me as strongly as upon any other American senator or citizen to make me desire that peace and harmony may prevail throughout this broad land; that my own country, worthier of my love than any other country under the sun, may be united now, henceforth and forever; and that it may, by means of such harmony and union, continually rise in prosperity, greatness and glory.

The honorable senator has based on that appeal a remonstrance against my remark, that "the time for compromises has passed." The honorable senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS], to whom this bill

owes its principal features, has disclaimed for it not only the form but also the character of a compromise. Assuming, however, with the senator from Kentucky, that this is its true character, I must say, nevertheless, that he misunderstands me, when he supposes that I am opposed to all compromises of all questions, on all occasions. My position concerning legislative compromises is this, namely: personal, partisan, temporary and subordinate questions, may lawfully be compromised; but *principles* can never be justly or wisely made the subjects of compromise. By *principles* I mean the elements in public questions, of moral rights, political justice, and high national expediency. Does any honorable senator assert a different maxim on the subject of legislative compromise?

Unlike, perhaps, that honorable senator, I regard slavery as morally unjust, politically unwise, and socially pernicious, in some degree, in every community where it exists. Slavery once, and not long ago, was practically universal. It may be doubted whether, among all the distinguished men whose co-laborer I am in this august assembly, there is one who, more than myself, if he could trace his lineage upward through a period of five hundred or six hundred years, would not reach the *bar sinister*. I owe it to wise, virtuous, and bold legislators, who have gone before me, that I am not myself a slave, and that, within the state where I live, slavery has forever ceased to exist. I owe it to mankind and to posterity, that being a legislator now myself, slavery shall by no act of mine be established or extended; and by act of mine, God giving me grace, no human being shall ever hereafter be made or held a slave. This is a principle; and, being a principle, I cannot compromise it. Nevertheless, I am not, for that reason, to be supposed willing to be either turbulent or factious in resisting the majority of my countrymen, when, overruling me, they compromise principles even so sacred as this. I abide that reconsideration which I always hopefully believe near, and am sure is ultimately certain.

It was my fortune to have just come into congress when California, a free state, applied for admission into the Union. I insisted on her admission, without condition, qualification or compromise. Others here, on the contrary, demanded a compromise which should settle, as they said, all actual and all possible questions arising out of the subject of slavery in the United States, then, thenceforth, and forever. I showed that such a compromise was impracti-

cable. I maintained that questions arising out of slavery, from time to time, under different circumstances, and in different parts of the republic, conld only be justly and wisely settled, and indeed could only be settled at all, severally and distinctly, on the occasions on which they occurred. I was overruled; I was censured, how widely, how severely, all the world knows, for my refusal to join in a measure of peace and harmony, as it was called, which, as I thought, at the cost of sacrifices of freedom and justice, was expected to terminate the discussion of slavery in congress, and to restore harmony and concord throughout the country, and perpetuate them forever.

That compromise was made here about this hour, in a midsummer night like this, at the close of a long and stormy debate. Loud-mouthed artillery, from the terrace of the capitol, the next day announced to the people of the United States that the Wilmot proviso was buried under the floor of the senate chamber, and that the agitation of slavery was buried with it. Wherever I went, here or abroad, I was pointed out as a chief mourner—the last to leave that solemn ceremonial. Only four years elapsed, when those who had effected that compromise found it necessary to open to civilization the territories of Nebraska and Kansas, and they introduced into the senate a bill for that purpose. Then, all at once, the Wilmot proviso burst the cerements of its grave, and stalked through the senate chamber, clad in the same fearful horrors that it had worn before its interment.

The slavery question being thus reöpened, certainly by no act of mine, or of those who agree with me, the compromise acts of 1850 were reviewed. Those who favored the extension of slavery in the territories maintained that that compromise drew after it, as a consequence, an abrogation of the prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska, contained in the Missouri compromise act of 1820. Those who opposed the extension of slavery denied that consequence. I was among that number, and was again overruled. The majority here then hit upon a new expedient to bind down and confine the Wilmot proviso in its tomb, and prevent its possible resurrection forever. That expedient was, that congress should renounce, in favor of the inhabitants of the new territories, all jurisdiction on the subject of slavery therein. Having no faith in the justice or the wisdom of that expedient, I calmly warned the senate that they were only sending this perplexing question of slavery down to the

territories, to involve their inhabitants in factious and fruitless contests; and that it would come back again to the senate, red with the heat of those strifes, to be settled here at last. I insisted then that congress ought to discharge its proper responsibility, and decide whether Kansas and Nebraska should be slave territories or be free territories. The compromise ordnance, from the terrace of the capitol, announced to the people a new triumph, and I was again pronounced throughout the length and breadth of the land, a disappointed and overthrown agitator. Two years have elapsed. What is the result of this, the second compromise made within six years—a compromise consisting in the abnegation of federal power over the subject of slavery in the territories of the United States? The result, in its nature, is just what I predicted; while, in its aggravations, it surpasses all that my fanatical imagination had conceived.

I say again, and with emphasis, we have had enough of compromises on the subject of slavery. The day for them has passed. Do you ask what I would do on these disturbing questions? I answer, that I would do on these what I would do on all other questions. I hold this to be a government of majorities, modified indeed by complex constitutional limitations, but nevertheless a government of majorities.

It is the business of congress to adjust and determine all questions which legitimately come before it, and not to compromise them, or to devolve their decision upon others. True, I know very well that I might be overruled, and that slavery might be established by congress in a territory, where I should vote to establish freedom. In that case, slavery must remain there, until, in a constitutional way, it shall be removed. So, on the other hand, if freedom shall be established in the territories, where others vote to establish slavery, they too must submit, and abide the change they desire. True, I know there might be a difference of opinion between the house of representatives and the senate in such a case. In such an event we must wait until the two houses can agree—to-morrow, the next month or the next year. The people will ultimately take care to constitute the two houses so that they shall agree. So much, sir, for my position upon the subject of compromises concerning the subject of slavery.

The territory of Kansas constitutes one twenty-fifth part of the whole dominion of the United States of America, sufficient to con-

stitute six states of the average size of those now enrolled in the confederacy. It is a territory which, thirty-five years ago, was with a peculiar felicity of wisdom consecrated to freedom, and assigned as an exclusive field of free labor. The distinguished senator from Delaware [Mr. CLAYTON] now argues to convince us that that beneficent act was unconstitutional. The question which is thus raised is merely incidental and collateral now. I am content, therefore, on this occasion, to reply, that the act was a compromise; that it received the form, name and character of a compromise, at that time, by the slaveholding states and the free states, as parties having conflicting interests to be settled. And it received that form, name, and character, for the purpose of binding the faith of all parties against a repeal or disturbance of it, on the ground of alleged unconstitutionality, or on any other ground. So it was received and acquiesced in by the people of the United States. So it took its place in the national history, and so it was respected and maintained by all parties until 1854. Congress in that year abrogated the beneficent guarantee of freedom, and thus offered and exposed the territory of Kansas, as well as that of Nebraska, to the intrusion of slavery and slave labor. But congress, nevertheless, replaced the old covenant of impartial freedom and free labor, with a guarantee that the inhabitants of Kansas, when coming to organize the territorial government after a model prescribed, should be perfectly free to establish freedom and free labor, and to reject slavery and menial labor. No sooner had this new congress assembled, than it was made known to us that that guarantee had failed; that, in the very moment of its organization, an armed foreign body entered the territory, assumed an attitude of actual war, usurped the franchises of the citizens, seized the machine of government, and converted it into a tyranny marked by the enforcement of despotic laws, by foreign legislators, magistrates, and ministerial officers; and that the president of the United States was maintaining this despotism in Kansas with the armed force of the United States. I brought these facts to the notice of the senate, together with the fact that the people of Kansas, free American citizens as they were, unwilling to acquiesce in that usurpation, and unable to submit to that despotism, had assembled at Topeka, in the manner customary on such occasions and, in acknowledged subjection to the jurisdiction of the United States, organized themselves, provisionally, into a state, and

were here, by representatives delegated to both houses, soliciting admission into the Union. I submitted to the senate that the new state of Kansas ought to be admitted, not because it would be always wise to admit whatever new states might come, and in whatever manner they might come, nor yet because it would have been wise, under other and different circumstances, to admit even Kansas herself; but simply because Kansas was held bound, hand and foot, under a foreign usurpation, at the feet of the president of the United States, and that her admission now was not only a necessary measure of relief and redress, but was the only practicable and adequate one.

I urged her admission on the senate upon three distinct grounds. First, that it would secure peace to Kansas and to the country, then fearfully threatened with commotion and civil war. Secondly, that it would be the means of protecting property, life, and liberty, within that territory, then dangerously exposed. Thirdly, that it would be the means of bringing Kansas into the Union as a free state, with the institutions of free labor, in compliance with that original pledge which once had been given the inhabitants of that territory, and afterwards revoked. I introduced a bill for the admission of the new state of Kansas, and advocated its passage on those grounds, while I urged my objections against the bill relating to the same subject, which had been presented to the senate by the committee on territories. There I left the debate, and I return to it now only because that committee have abandoned their first bill, and adopted the new one now under consideration. I stand now by my own bill, which I maintain to be preferable to the last bill of the committee, as it was to the first. Some honorable senators seem to think that it is unreasonable that I do not give up my own bill, and come down and accept the new one, which they are inclined to treat as a compromise between my own bill for the immediate admission of Kansas, under the Topeka constitution, and the first bill of the committee on territories. Why should I surrender my own bill? If it was wise, just, and necessary, when I presented it to the senate, it is as just, wise, and necessary now. It was wise, just, and necessary then, if the circumstances under which the constitution of Kansas was adopted were then truly stated and set forth by me, in my argument delivered in the senate. In making that argument, I had to rely on probable evidence, for no other evidence then existed.

Now, a committee of the house of representatives, after having diligently inquired on oath, have ascertained and confirmed the truth of the circumstances of Kansas which I then assumed. I state those circumstances anew, on the present occasion, in the moderate and guarded conclusions of the committee of the house of representatives:

"Spurious and pretended legislative, judicial, and executive officers have been set over them, by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of the government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced;

"The rights of the people to keep and bear arms have been infringed;

"Test oaths, of an extraordinary and entangling nature, have been imposed as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage and holding office;

"The right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury has been denied;

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, has been violated;

"They have been deprived of life, liberty, and property, without due process of law;

"The freedom of speech and of the press has been abridged;

"The right to choose their representatives has been made of no effect;

"Murders, robberies, and arsons, have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished;

"All these things have been done with the knowledge, sanction, and procurement of the present administration."

Why, then, under these circumstances, should I abandon my own bill? The honorable committee on territories have shown me marked attention, by bestowing some criticisms upon that bill. They inform the senate that the boundaries of the state of Kansas assigned by the bill differ from the boundaries assigned by the Topeka constitution. The explanation is a simple one. My bill was drawn before the Topeka constitution had reached the senate—certainly, before it had reached me. To avoid all question on the subject of boundaries, I adopted those which were assigned in the bill which had been reported by the committee on territories.

Again, the learned committee express a doubt in their report whether my bill is framed so as to admit the state of Kansas under the Topeka constitution. I have only to say, in reply, that the bill proposes that the state of Kansas shall be admitted immediately. The state of Kansas certainly has no other constitution than the Topeka one; and the bill, in form, is *mutatis mutandis*, identical with the law under which California was admitted into the Union,

and now holds her place in the confederacy. These, sir, are unimportant matters—matters of mere detail, unworthy to dwell upon at this hour of the night, and at this late stage in the session of congress.

I object to the new bill of the committee on territories, for weightier reasons than any of mere criticism on details. I confess, frankly, that I regard it as a bill of concession, if not of compromise. Certainly it goes too far in its concessions to the friends of freedom in Kansas, to be identical with the bill which it has supplanted in the affections of the committee on territories. It permits the people of Kansas to come into the Union with such population as they may have on the 4th of July next, instead of obliging them to wait until they shall have a population of ninety-three thousand four hundred and twenty souls. It seems at least also to waive the previous proposition of the committee on territories, of an appropriation for extraordinary expense to maintain peace and order, in subjection to the usurping authorities in Kansas. But, while the bill goes so far, I object against it, that it stops short of a remedy which would restore peace, safety, and freedom, in Kansas.

I am not bound, by any previous committals, to accept any bill which stops short of those objects.

First, however, I inquire what substantial objection lies against my own bill? There is only one which is now seriously insisted upon, which is, that the formation and adoption of the Topeka constitution were the acts, not of the whole people, but of one political party—a portion of the people of Kansas only. The honorable senator from Georgia says that the constitution received only seven hundred votes. It is true that the free state party instituted proceedings to call a convention to decide whether it was expedient to establish a provisional state, and also the proceedings to call a convention to frame the constitution. But they invited all parties, and all the citizens of Kansas, to participate in the decision of every question which was thus brought under discussion; and they provided that the proceedings should stand or fall, according to the will of the whole people of Kansas, expressed through the ballot boxes in the customary way. By majorities, thus formally ascertained, the convention was called and held, and the constitution was established and promulgated. Who else should have called the convention, or instituted proceedings towards the adoption of the constitution? Not congress, for congress had been silent on the

subject in the organic law! Not the president nor the government, for neither had power. Not the territorial legislature; that was the authority which was to be subverted by substituting for it a federal state. Not those who upheld that legislature, because they were content. It is the party which needs and desires improvement or innovation, in every state, that initiates the proceedings by which it is to be effected. It was unfortunate that the election for the adoption of the constitution occurred only two days after a new foray of the Missourians in the territory had terrified and alarmed the people, and rendered it unsafe for the citizens of Kansas to attend the polls, in all the districts throughout the territory. This misfortune, however, resulted from no fault of the convention, or of the majority who adopted the constitution. The misfortune itself lends strength to the application for the admission of the state. And there can be no mistake in assuming that the convention was sustained by a majority of the people, since we find, by the report of the committee of the house of representatives, that elections were held in seventeen districts, which gave for the constitution seventeen hundred and thirty-one votes, and only forty six votes against it; while in the town of Leavenworth its opponents destroyed the ballot boxes, which were known to contain about five hundred additional affirmative votes, with only thirty-eight adverse votes. The state of California was admitted into this Union, upon proceedings no more legitimate, no more regular, no more warranted by any pre-existing laws, than these.

What California did, was rightly done, but it was not done in pursuance of any law. It was done without law, and it was justified then as I justify similar proceedings in Kansas now, on the ground of a high political necessity.

Another though lighter objection has been urged against my bill, namely: that the Topeka constitution provides that it shall not be changed in less than nine years. I do not know this fact, but I am bound to assume it, on the statement of the honorable senator from Georgia. My answer is, that I am not responsible for that provision in the constitution. It is an objection of the same character with one that is made by the honorable senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], namely: that the Topeka constitution excludes free colored persons from Kansas. I reply to both of these objections. I take the constitution, as we all must take it, for better or for worse

—just as it is—or we cannot admit the state at all. The people in new states make their constitutions. Our power is limited to the admission or rejection of a state, whatever its constitution may be. Again, it is not clear that the provision complained of by the senator from Georgia will prevent the people of Kansas from subverting this constitution, and establishing a new one, at any time short of the expiration of nine years. The constitution of the state of New York, established in 1821, provided for alterations only to be made with the consent of two successive legislatures. A party desiring radical innovation, and finding it impossible to obtain that object in the form prescribed in the constitution, secured a majority in the legislature, and, without any constitutional authority, carried through a law by which proceedings were instituted for calling a convention, which was subsequently held, and which framed a new constitution. This new constitution being submitted to the people, and approved by them, in derogation of the old one, became, and it yet remains, the supreme law of the land.

(Mr. WELLER—A state constitution must only be republican in form.)

I thank the honorable senator for the suggestion, that the only question necessary and practical here is, whether Kansas has a constitution which is republican in form. To most senators, that is enough, under any circumstances. I confess it is not enough for me. If the provisional state of Deseret shall come here with a constitution which shall sanction polygamy, I certainly shall vote against admitting as a state a community which has revived that eminently patriarchal institution, without stopping to decide whether the institution is in harmony with republicanism or not.

I pass now from my own bill to consider the new bill presented by the committee on territories. So far as the subject of slavery is concerned, the most which can be claimed for this bill is, that it gives an equal chance to the people of Kansas to choose between freedom and slavery. I can well understand that the senator from Georgia and the committee on territories regard this feature of the bill as being entirely just. I differ from them only because the standard of political justice which commends itself to me, is a more rigid one. I recognize no equality, in moral right or political expediency, between slavery and freedom. I hold the one to be decidedly good, and the other to be positively bad. I do not think it wise, or just,

or necessary, to give to the people of a territory, where slavery does not exist, and never has existed, the privilege of choosing slavery. The inhabitants of a new territory are necessarily in a condition of pupilage, needing the guardian care as well as counsel of congress. The experience of Kansas confirms this truth. On the 28th day of May, 1854, there was no civil community, practically there was not one lawful citizen within the territory. The Kansas organic law passed, and lo! there was at once on the statute book a civil community there. But what was its condition? There were a few emigrants scattered throughout a territory of vast extent, unknown to each other; unorganized, absolutely without civil institutions, without a treasury, or a militia, or public edifices, without organized political parties, and without cultivated fields, or workshops, or established markets, and almost without habitations or homes; incompetent to self-defense or self-government, they were overborne by a small intrusive force from an adjoining state; addressed by foreign factions, with present temptations and seductions, without having any concert of action amongst themselves, they were appealed to, on the one side, to institute slavery, not for their own benefit, but for the supposed benefit of the slaveholding states, and to weaken the power of the free states—and on the other, by arguments having little weight, amid the confusion incident to the organization of a territory. Thus the greatest political question that could be submitted to any people, a question which congress itself has been unable to solve, was devolved for its settlement upon a community which, although it possessed extraordinary intelligence, was, by reason of its immaturity, unable to elect even a legislature and a magistracy for itself. The result has been, not the voluntary establishment of popular sovereignty or of self government, with or without slavery, but a conquest and subjugation of the territory, with the establishment of slavery, by slaveholders from Missouri. I maintain, and no one here will deny, that it would have been unwise and injurious to the people of Kansas, if congress had directly established slavery in that territory by the organic law. Congress was bound to foresee the operation of the organic law which it passed. And congress could not pass a law, the operation of which would be to establish slavery within the territory by indirect means, with any more wisdom, or justice, or benevolence, than it could have directly established slavery there. I say, therefore, that the existing state of things in Kansas

is the result of the wrongful and injurious legislation of congress itself. I maintain, still more, that since there was a possibility that slavery might be established within the territory through popular mistake, or surprise, or conquest, it was a solemn responsibility resting upon congress to withhold from the people therein—so few, scattered, feeble, unorganized, and deficient in the consolidation which is essential to every civil state, at least until they should have attained something more of organization and maturity—the power to decide so fearful a question. You will tell me that this is a denial of the capacity and of the right of a civil community to exercise self-government. It is a very different thing. It is only insisting that a people must have the necessary elements of a civil community, before the power of self-government can safely be assumed by them. I admit and maintain the right of every individual citizen to enjoy and exercise freedom and self-control, subject to the municipal law of the land. But I deny, at the same time, that it is a parental right or duty to refer to the infant child, who is ultimately to become a citizen, the choice, during his minority, between health and disease, or between virtue and crime. The long and short of the whole matter is, that until the territories of the United States become matured and qualified to assume all the powers of municipal government, and to be admitted as states into the Union, they are dependencies in pupilage on the federal government, and congress is their only real and sovereign legislature. If slavery is a good institution, a necessary one, and one consistent with the constitution of the United States, we ought at once to establish it by our own act within every territory of the United States. If, on the contrary, slavery is the opposite of all these things, as in my judgment it is, then we ought by our own act to save every territory of the United States from slavery. On this principle I have acted throughout in regard to Kansas, as I have acted throughout in regard to Utah and New Mexico. On this principle, God being my helper, I shall act in regard to all territories of the United States, so long as I shall remain here—so long as I shall live.

I do not now pursue the question of the right or of the power of congress to prohibit slavery in the territories of the United States, above this level of realities, into the clouds, where the honorable senator from Delaware has sent it. I do not inquire now whether congress can lawfully prevent a state from establishing slavery, when

adopting its first constitution, or when changing an old constitution for a new one. Practically, that question is immaterial, and merely a hypothetical one. It assumes that a state in which slavery has no existence, and which is left perfectly free to choose liberty and reject slavery, will nevertheless establish slavery; and this, too, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era. No state, under such circumstances, has ever made such a choice; no state, under such circumstances, ever will. We had one state without slavery when the revolution began; that state [Massachusetts] is a free state yet. We had, at the close of the revolution, twelve other states, all which were slave states. Of these, seven have already abolished slavery. We have added to these thirteen states eighteen more, and not one of those eighteen, which was free from slavery while in a territorial condition, has ever since adopted it. On the other hand, more than one of those states, which had some territorial or provincial experience of slavery, have firmly and perseveringly excluded it. Within the same period slavery has been abolished by Mexico, by all the Central American states, by Chili and by Peru; and it now exists only in one state on the American continent, besides our own country, and that is the empire of Brazil. During the same period, no European state has established slavery. Great Britain has abolished it; France and Denmark have abolished it; Spain is abolishing it; Russia, and even Turkey, are abolishing it. What wretched sophistry is this, to charge me with exercising tyranny over the territories of the United States—the children of the federal republic—because I deny to them the ruinous privilege of choosing an evil and a curse, which no matured state, already exempt from it, will adopt, and which all such states afflicted with it relieve themselves from as speedily as possible!

I am opposed to this bill for these reasons, which are drawn exclusively from its bearings upon the people of Kansas. I am equally opposed to it, for reasons drawn from its bearings upon the whole Federal Union. I think that the addition of every new slave state increases and prolongs the disturbances of peace and harmony in the country. I know of no evil, social or political, which is ever supposed to threaten the stability of the Union, that does not arise immediately out of the existence of slavery. If this Union is threatened in the south, it is because the rights of slaveholders are supposed

to be endangered. If it is threatened in the north, it is because the power of slaveholders is supposed to be on the increase.

It is clear that the more we multiply slave states, the more this fountain of bitterness will overflow. Again, the more we multiply slave states, the more we hinder the emancipation of slaves in the old states. That emancipation, although it is to be instituted, managed and conducted by those slave states themselves, is a reformation due from them to themselves and to the whole Union, because upon it depend the highest possible development of national wealth, and the highest possible increase of national strength and power. While I do not maintain that slavery is incompatible with the attainment of a certain stage of prosperity in some states, under some circumstances, I do insist, on the contrary, that, all other things being equal, every state flourishes permanently just in proportion as its laboring population are intelligent, inventive and free. I am opposed to the policy of the bill, because the addition of slave states tends to continue and increase the dependence of our country upon the manufacturing industry and the financial systems of foreign countries, and thus to build up those great interests in foreign countries, instead of making our systems of manufactures and finance continental and independent. During this debate, the bill has been altered (I cannot say, in parliamentary language, *amended*) by the incorporation of a feature which, if the bill were otherwise entirely acceptable, would necessarily deprive it of my support. The organic law conferred the right of suffrage not only upon aliens who had become duly naturalized, but also upon alien inhabitants who have in the forms of law declared their intention to become citizens. The bill before us now disfranchises this latter class. I am not to say now for the first time, that I regard this know-nothing or American policy as being equally unjust and unwise. I hold that the right of suffrage is coëxtensive with the obligation of submission to constituted republican authority. While this bill overthrows that principle essential to freedom on the one side, it strikes a blow equally dangerous to freedom on the other, by an indirect invitation to the slaveholder to bring his bondman into the territory, and thus practically exclude the disfranchised European emigrant. As a general fact, labor in Kansas, as in all our other territories and states, must be performed either by slaves or by European immigrants. The American people, educated and trained as they are, do not furnish an adequate supply of native

labor. This bill encourages slave labor, and discourages immigrant free labor.

There is another broad objection to the bill, when regarded as a measure which may result in the establishment of slavery in the territories. If I were asked what I think is the real ground of whatever antagonism exists between the free states and the slave states, I should say, that it consists in the unequal extent within which the pure democratic principle has worked out its proper results in the two sections. In the free states, labor being emancipated, seizes upon the democratic machinery of the government, and works out the results of political and social equality with great rapidity and success. Thus labor rules in the free states. In the slave states, labor being enslaved, the operation of the pure democratic principle is hindered, and the consequence is, that capital is more successful in retaining its ancient sway. I am opposed to the policy of favoring the multiplication of slave states, on the ground, broader than any I have yet taken, that it is injurious to the cause of human society itself. I think it clear, that if the sense of mankind in all civilized nations could be taken, it would be found to require that slavery should be brought to an end wherever it exists, not immediately or suddenly, by violence, or without indemnity, but with moderation, prudence and sagacious administration, and as soon as it can be done, consistently with equal justice. I am unwilling to oppose myself or to place my country in an attitude of defiance against the judgment and benevolence of mankind.

I have sought to find out what plausible ground there can be for the creation of a slave state in Kansas, by the act or with the consent of congress. The only ground which seems to me to reach that dignity is, that the existing slave states require room for expansion beyond their borders. I know that growing states need room. The state of New York, before it even comprehended its own destiny, or had assumed its true character, had already reproduced itself in Vermont. Since that time, it has practically extended itself in the forms of new and additional states upon the shores of all the upper lakes. I do not, however, see a necessity for more room on the part of the slave states. Of course, I speak with much hesitation, but, nevertheless, according to the facts as I understand them. The free states have an area of 612,597 square miles, and sustain a population of fourteen millions. The slave states, with only ten millions

of inhabitants, have an area of 851,508 square miles. The free states have a population of twenty-two to a square mile. The slave states have a population of only eleven to a square mile. The increase of the white population within the last sixty years has been 16,380,604, or 516 per cent; while the slave population has increased during the same time only 2,506,416, or 359 per cent. It may be safely inferred from these facts that the slave states will actually need no more room within the next half century. Again, if I do not mistake, regarding the extension of slave territory merely in an economical aspect, as affecting the price of slaves, I think it clear that further expansion would be injurious to the slave states themselves. The cost of an able-bodied slave, though he is inferior in capacity and intelligence to the white laborer, already exceeds the full cost of the education and maintenance of a white laborer in Europe until he attains his maturity. If then, free immigrants existed in sufficient numbers, and had the disposition to migrate into slaveholding states, they would supplant slavery there altogether.

Since it thus appears that the slave states have no need for room for further expansion, the anxiety and solicitude for the safety of the slave states against an unreasonable excess of slaves within their territories, which have been so freely and earnestly expressed during this debate, are quite unreal and groundless.

I pass on to examine the bill in its bearings upon the restoration of order and the safety of property, liberty and life within the territory of Kansas. The bill is especially commended to us on the ground that it will effect those great objects. But it seems to me to fall short of them altogether. It proposes that the people of the territory may hold a convention in December next, and adopt a state constitution. They may refuse to adopt a constitution; and if they should adopt one, congress may nevertheless reject the new state. If the people make it a free state, the senate may reject it, because it is free. If it is made a slave state, by any means, the house of representatives may reject it, because it is a slave state. In either case the remedy is at an end, and the territory will be left just where it is now. During the intervening interval, and after it, the usurped and tyrannical government of the Missouri borderers will remain in the full exercise of their hateful functions. The same popular spirit of resolute independence which justly resists them now, will continue to resist them hereafter. The territory is practically under

martial law now, and under martial law it must remain. Whereas, if you admit the state now under the Topeka constitution, or otherwise abolish the usurpation existing there, it must happen either that the army may be withdrawn, or that, while it shall maintain peace and order, oppression will cease.

The bill declares that laws of a certain character shall not be enforced within the territory, and the honorable senator from Kentucky regards this provision as abrogating some of the tyrannical laws enacted by the usurping legislature. Certainly it does not abolish all those laws. It is doubtful how many, or which of them, it does abolish, and whether it will abolish any of them effectually. If I did not misunderstand the honorable senator from Georgia, the author of the bill, he gave it as his opinion, that while the bill reässerts and reënacts the bill of rights contained in the constitution of the United States, these obnoxious laws of Kansas do not in fact conflict with that bill of rights. Here, then, will be ample room for misapprehension, misunderstanding, and conflict. The free state party will assume that these obnoxious laws of the usurping legislature are annulled. The slave state men, on the other hand, will maintain that they all remain in force. The conflict between them will go to the courts of the territory, for their decision. From those courts there is no appeal in criminal cases to the supreme court of the United States. How those courts will decide on questions to which they are virtually a party, we already know too well, because we know they have already adjudicated that a tavern, in which free state men are entertained, is a nuisance, and that free state presses are nuisances, and that even a bridge, over which free state men travel, is also a nuisance; and that all these nuisances may be abated, on the presentment of a packed grand jury, without a trial, and by an armed *posse comitatus*, consisting of enlisted pro-slavery bands; and we know, also, that treason to the United States is adjudged by the same courts to consist not merely in levying war against the United States, or giving aid and countenance to their enemies, but in assembling peacefully as citizens, to petition congress for a redress of grievances.

The process which this bill proposes for taking the census, districting the territory, and ascertaining the qualifications of electors and conducting the elections, is to be confided to a commission appointed by the president of the United States, by and with the

advice and consent of the senate. I have already seen who was first appointed governor of the territory by the president and senate, and how, and upon what grounds, he was removed by the president; and who was appointed his successor by the president and senate, and how, and upon what grounds, he is retained by the president. I have also seen who were appointed judges and marshals for the territory by the president and senate, and how, and upon what grounds, they are still retained in office by the president. I have seen how the governor, judges and marshals have plunged the territory into all the horrors of anarchy and civil war, in an effort to compel the people to relinquish the right of self-government, or to flee from the territory for their lives. I want no more civil agents within the territory appointed by the present president of the United States. I said, when I addressed the senate in April last, that Kansas was brought to a state of revolution by the oppressions of the president of the United States, and had assumed an attitude of revolution, which was tolerated, indeed, by the constitution, but was, nevertheless, an attitude of revolution; and that, in this, as in all revolutions, the evil could only be corrected by separating the oppressed altogether from their political relations to the oppressor. I say the same thing now.

I will not dwell minutely on other objections which have been justly raised by my associates here. I am content to say, in general terms, that the president of the United States has perpetrated a *coup d'état*, by which the territorial constitution, given to the people of Kansas by the congress of the United States, has been absolutely subverted; that the president holds despotic power over that people, in the name and the form, indeed, of spurious, legislative, ministerial, and judicial authorities; that slavery is practically established there already by force; that a portion of the people are slain, while a larger portion have been expelled from the territory by force; that the freedom of speech and of the press, and the personal inviolability of the electors, as well as the purity of the ballot-box, are subverted, while the leaders of the party of freedom are either dispersed beyond the territory, or imprisoned within it, on charges of pretended crimes. The elector can only reach the polls and deposit his vote under the protection of the army of the United States. The circumstances are parallel, almost to the line of coincidence, with those which attended the election by which the republicans of

France invested Louis Napoleon with the powers of an absolute despotism. Fix a day upon which the people of Kansas shall decide between slavery and freedom, and, from that day what remains of free population will be spirited away. A new and factitious immigration of pro-slavery electors will rush into the territory from adjacent slave states. Order and silence will indeed prevail. The elector will receive his ballot at the hands of the soldiers who have restored the territory to this condition of quiet and peace; and the counting of the ballots will tell the simple story that the Missouri territorial usurpation is adopted and converted into a state sovereignty, by the voice of the enslaved people of Kansas.

Here is a premonition of the manner in which a slave state convention would be obtained under this bill. It is an extract from the testimony of Colonel John Scott, of St. Joseph, Missouri, given before the committee of investigation, and will be found in their report:

"It is my intention, and the intention of a great many other Missourians now resident in Missouri, whenever the slavery issue is to be determined upon by the people of this territory in the adoption of the state constitution, to remove to this territory in time to acquire the right to become legal voters upon that question. The leading purpose of our intended removal to the territory is to determine the domestic institutions of this territory, when it comes to be a state; and we would not come but for that purpose, and would never think of coming here but for that purpose. I believe there are a great many in Missouri who are so situated."

We are assured, indeed, that the bill shall be so modified as to allow the electors, who have fled the territory, to return. Who can vouch for the ability of those poor emigrants, scattered over the free states, to return to their homes in the territory, even if they should be so disposed? None can be safe in the territory without arms, or being alone. None can return to the territory in numbers, and with arms, because such parties are disarmed, and sent back by the army of the United States.

The honorable senator from Kentucky [Mr. CRITTENDEN], asks me whether I will do nothing—whether nothing shall be done to compose the fatal strife in Kansas, which, he says, no one has depicted in deeper colors than myself. I answer, Yes. I will vote for the admission of Kansas into the Union, under the Topeka constitution. That measure, and that measure only, will restore peace and harmony, while it will rescue freedom from peril. Take that measure

If such a thing is possible, as turning a free state into a slave state, you will yet have the opportunity to do so, if the welfare of Kansas, and of our common country, should seem to you to require it. If you will not adopt that measure, it will then remain for you to propose another remedy; but it must be more just and more tolerant of freedom than either of those which you have already submitted to the senate, and it must surrender all the vantage ground in the territory, which slavery has acquired by fraud or force. If this bill, now before the senate, is your ultimatum, then the people of Kansas must trust to that change of public sentiment and of public opinion now going on throughout the United States, which, although it yet has to acquire the strength of habit and the power of complete organization, nevertheless, I think, is sure enough to break all the fetters which have been already fastened upon them, and all that remain within the forge of executive despotism. To the people of Kansas, and to every advocate of their cause, in this the crowning trial of their fidelity, I say, in the language of the rule I have adopted for the government of my own conduct,

> ——"Let thy scope
> Be one fix'd mind for all; thy rights approve
> To thy own conscience gradually renewed;
> Learn to make Time the father of wise Hope;
> Then trust thy cause to the arm of Fortitude,
> The light of Knowledge, and the warmth of Love."

KANSAS AND THE ARMY.[1]

THIS is a bill appropriating about twelve millions of dollars, to defray the expenses of the military establishment of the United States, for the ensuing fiscal year. Its form and effect are those which distinguish a general appropriation bill for the support of the army, such as is annually passed by congress. Only one exception to it, as it came to the senate from the house of representatives, has been taken here. It contains what is practically an inhibition of the employment of the army of the United States, by the president, to

[1] Speech on the Army Bill in the United States senate, August 7, 1856.

enforce the so-called laws of the alleged legislature of the territory of Kansas. The senate regards that inhibition as an obnoxious feature, and has, by what is called an amendment, proposed to strike it from the bill, overruling therein my vote; and the senate now proposes to pass the bill thus altered here, and to remit it to the house of representatives, for concurrence in the alteration. In the hope that that house will insist on the prohibition which has been disapproved here, and that the senate will, in case of conflict, ultimately recede, I shall vote against the passage of the bill in its present shape.

In submitting my reasons for this course, I have little need to tread in the several courses of argument which have been opened by distinguished senators who have gone before me in this debate. Certainly, however, I shall attempt to emulate the examples of the honorable senators from Virginia and South Carolina [Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BUTLER], by avoiding remarks in any degree personal, because, on an occasion of such grave importance, although I may not be able to act with wisdom, I am sure I can so far practice self-control as to debate with decency, and deport myself with dignity. I shall neither defend nor arraign any political party, because I should vote on this occasion just as I am now going to vote, if not merely one of the parties, but all of the parties in the country stood arrayed against me.

I shall not reply to any of the criticisms which have been bestowed upon the inhibition proposed by the house of representatives, nor shall I attempt to reconcile that inhibition with other bills, which have been passed by the house of representatives and sent to this house for concurrence. I shall not even stop to vindicate my own consistency of action in regard to the territory of Kansas; because, first, I am not to assume that what now seems an opening disagreement between the senate and the house of representatives, will ripen into a case of decided conflict; and because, secondly, if it shall so ripen, then there will be time for argument at every stage of the disagreement; while its entire progress and consummation will necessarily be searchingly reviewed throughout the length and breadth of the country, and the conflict itself will thereafter stand a landmark for all time in the history of the republic. I shall endeavor to confine myself closely to the questions which are immediately involved, at this hour, in a debate which, in the event

apprehended, will survive all existing interests and all living statesmen.

The prohibition of the employment of the army to enforce alleged statutes in Kansas, which the house of representatives proposes, and which the senate disapproves, grows out of the conflict of opinion which divides the senate unequally, which divides the house of representatives itself nearly equally, and which, if the prohibition itself expresses the opinion of a majority of that house, separates it from the senate and from the president of the United States. It is manifestly a conflict which divides the country by a parallel of latitude. In this conflict, one party maintains, as I do, that the legislation, and the territorial legislature itself, of Kansas, are absolutely void. The other party, on the contrary, insists that the legislation and the legislature of the territory of Kansas are valid, and must remain so until they shall be constitutionally superseded or abrogated.

The senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTER] argues that the act of the house of representatives, in inserting the prohibition in this bill, is revolutionary, and that persistence in it would effect a change of the constitution of the government. I refrain from arguing that question elaborately now, because, while I am satisfied, from my knowledge of the temper and habit of the senate, that it is likely enough to adhere to the course which it has indicated, I am at the same time by no means so certain that the house of representatives will not ultimately recede from the ground which, by the act of a bare majority, at all times unreliable during the present session, it has assumed. I speak with the utmost respect towards the house of representatives, and with entire confidence in the patriotic motives of all its members; but I must confess that, in all questions concerning freedom and slavery in the United States, I have seen houses of representatives, when brought into conflict with the senate of the United States, recede too often and retreat too far to allow me to assume that in this case the present house of representatives will maintain the high position it has assumed with firmness and perseverance to the end. I saw a house of representatives, in 1850, which was delegated and practically pledged to prohibit the extension of slavery within the unorganized territories of the United States, then newly acquired from Mexico, refuse to perform that great duty, and enter into a compromise, which, however intended, practically led to the abandonment of all those territories to universal

desecration by slavery. I saw a house of representatives, in 1854, forget the sacred reverence for freedom of those by whom it was constituted, and abrogate the time-honored law under which the territories of Kansas and Nebraska had until that time remained safe, amid the wreck which followed the unfortunate compromise of 1850, and thus prepare the way for that invasion by slavery of all that yet remained for the sway of freedom in the ancient domain of Louisiana, which has since taken place in Kansas.

Ever since I adopted for myself the policy of opposing the spread of slavery in the train of our national banner, consecrated to equal and universal freedom, my hopes have been fixed, not on existing presidents, senates, or houses of representatives, but on future presidents and future congresses—and my hopes and faith grow stronger and stronger, as each succeeding president, senate, and house of representatives, fails to adopt and establish that policy, so eminently constitutional and conservative. My hopes and my faith thus grow on disappointment, because I see that by degrees, which are marked, although the progress seems slow, my countrymen, who alone create presidents and congresses, are coming to apprehend the wisdom and justice of that beneficent policy, and to accept it. The short-comings of the present house of representatives do not discourage me. I do not even hold that body responsible. I know how, in the very midst of the canvass in which its members were elected, the public mind was misled, and diverted to the discussion of false and fraudulent issues concerning the principles and policy of the church of Rome, and the temper, disposition, and conduct of aliens incorporated into the republic. But although I hold the present house of representatives excusable, I must, nevertheless, in assigning its true character, be allowed to say of it, that it is deceptive like the moon, which presents a broad surface, all smooth and luminous when seen at a distance, but covered with rough and dark mountains when brought near to the eye by the telescope. I shall vote, therefore, on this occasion, with the house of representatives, against a majority of the senate, careless whether that house itself shall, like other houses of representatives which have gone before it, renounce and repudiate its own decision which I thus sustain, and complacently range itself, with the senate and the president of the United States, against myself and those senators who shall have gone with me to its support.

The subject under consideration is legitimately within the jurisdiction of congress, and consequently within the jurisdiction of the house of representatives. There must be authority somewhere to decide whether the territorial legislature of Kansas is a legal and constitutional body, and whether its statutes are valid. The president of the United States has no authority to decide those questions definitely, because the decision involves an act of sovereign legislation within the constitutional sphere of congress. The judiciary cannot decisively determine those questions, because their own determinations, in such a case, may be modified or reversed, and set aside by constitutional legislative enactment, and because the judiciary has no power to apply the means necessary to give effect to its decisions.

The subject is an actual government of the territory of Kansas, to be established and maintained by constitutional laws. All legislative power over Kansas, as well as all legislative power whatever permitted by the constitution of the United States, is vested in congress, and of course in the house of representatives, coördinately with the senate, and subject to a veto of the president. The house of representatives may constitutionally pass a bill abrogating the pretended legislation and legislature of Kansas, or declaring them to be already absolutely void. The greater includes the less. The house of representatives may, therefore, lawfully pass a bill prohibiting the employment of the army of the United States in executing laws in Kansas, which it deems pernicious, no matter by whom those laws were made.

Since the house of representatives has power to pass such a bill distinctly, it has power, also, to place an equivalent prohibition in any bill which it has constitutional power to pass. And so it has a constitutional right to place the prohibition in the annual army appropriation bill.

I grant that this mode of reaching the object proposed is an unusual one, and in some respects an inconvenient one. It is not, therefore, however, an unconstitutional one, or even necessarily a wrong one.

It is a right one, if it is necessary to effect the object desired, and if that object is one that is in itself just, and eminently important to the peace and happiness of the country, or to the security of the liberties of the people. The house of representatives, moreover, is entitled to judge and determine for itself, whether the proceeding

is thus necessary, and whether the object of it is thus important. It is true that the senate may dissent from the house, and refuse to concur in the prohibition. In that case, each of the two houses exercises an independent right of its own, and upon its own proper responsibility to the people. If the conflict shall continue to the end, and the bill therefore shall fail, the people will decide between the two houses, in the elections which will follow, and they will take care to bring them to an agreement in harmony with the popular decision.

The proceeding in the present case is thus necessary, and its object is thus important. Pretended but invalid laws are enacted by usurpation, and enforced by the president of the United States in the territory of Kansas, with the terror, if not with an actual application, of the military arm of the government. At least, this is the case assumed by the house of representatives. It is altogether a new one. It has not occurred before. It has never even been supposed possible that such a case could happen in a territory of the United States. The idea has never before entered into the mind of an American statesman, that citizens of one state could with armed force enter any other state or territory, and by fraud or force usurp its government, and establish a tyranny over its people, much less that a president of the United States would be found to sanction such a subversion of state authority or of federal authority; and still less, that a president thus sanctioning it would employ the standing army to maintain the odious usurpation and tyranny.

The mere fact, in this case, that the army is required to be employed to execute alleged laws in Kansas, is enough to raise a presumption that those laws are either wrong in principle or destitute of constitutional authority, and ought not to be executed.

The territory of Kansas, although not a state, is, or ought to be, nevertheless, a civil community, with a republican system of government. In other words, it is *de jure*, and ought to be *de facto*, a republic—an American republic, existing under and by virtue of the constitution of the United States. If the laws which are to be executed there are really the statutes of such a republican government truly existing there, then those laws were made by the people of Kansas by their own voluntary act. According to the theory of our government, these laws will be acquiesced in by that people, and executed with their own consent against all offenders, by means of

merely civil police, without the aid of the army of the United States. The army of the United States is not a mere institution of domestic police; nor is it a true or proper function of the army to execute the domestic laws of the several states and territories. Its legitimate and proper functions are to repel foreign invasion, and suppress insurrections of the native Indian tribes. It is only an occasional and incidental function of that army to suppress insurrections of citizens seldom expected to occur.

This capitol is surrounded by a national metropolis, and its streets, lanes, and alleys are doubtless filled with misery and guilt, adequate to the generation of all sorts of crimes. Yet the laws prescribed for municipal government within the district of Columbia are executed without the aid of the army of the United States. Neither house of congress, nor the common council of Washington, nor the common council of Georgetown, nor the president of the United States, nor the marshal of the district of Columbia, nor yet the mayors of either of those cities, nor any court within the district, is attended by any armed force or detachment, or protected even by an armed sentinel.

Why is this so? It is because the people acquiesce, and the laws execute themselves. This case of the district of Columbia is the strongest which can be presented against the principle for which I contend, for the people of the district are actually disfranchised, out of regard to the security of the federal government.

Look into the states—into Maryland on one side of the federal capital, and into Virginia on the other; into Delaware as you ascend northward, into North Carolina as you descend southward, into Pennsylvania and into South Carolina, into New Jersey and into Georgia, even into Maine and into Texas; go eastward—go westward, throughout all the states, throughout even the territories, Minnesota, Utah, Washington, Oregon, and New Mexico—everywhere throughout the republic, from the gulf of St. Lawrence to the gulf of Mexico, from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific ocean—everywhere, except in Kansas, the people are dwelling in peaceful submission to the laws which they themselves have established, free from any intrusion of the army of the United States. The time was, and that not long ago, when a proposition to employ the standing army of the United States as a domestic police would have been universally denounced as a premature revelation of a plot, darkly

contrived in the chambers of conspiracy, to subvert the liberties of the people, and to overthrow the republic itself.

The republic stands upon a fundamental principle, that the people, in the exercise of equal rights, will establish only just and equal laws, and that their own free and enlightened public opinion is the only legitimate reliance for the maintenance and execution of such laws. This principle is not even peculiar to ourselves—it lies at the foundation of the government of every free people on earth. It is public opinion, not the imperial army, that executes the laws of the realm in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Whenever France is free, it is public opinion that executes the laws of her republican legislature. It is public opinion that executes the laws in all the cantons of Switzerland. The British constitution is quite as jealous of standing armies as a police, as our own. Government there, indeed, maintains standing armies, as it does a great naval force; but it employs the one, as it does the other, exclusively for defense, or for conquest, against foreign states. Fearful lest the armed power of the state might be turned against the people, to enforce obnoxious edicts or statutes, the British constitution forbids that any regular army whatever shall be tolerated, on any pretense. The considerable military force which is maintained in different and distant parts of the empire, only exists by a suspension of that part of the constitution, which suspension is renewed by Parliament from year to year, and never for more than one year at a time. Civil liberty, and a standing army for the purposes of civil police, have never yet stood together, and never can stand together. If I am to choose between upholding laws, in any part of this republic, which cannot be maintained without a standing army, or relinquishing the laws themselves, I give up the laws at once by whomsoever they are made, and by whatever authority; for, either our system of government is radically wrong, or such laws are unjust, unequal, and pernicious.

Such is the presumption against the pretended laws of Kansas, which arises out of the proposition to debate. I shall not, however, in so grave a case, leave my argument to rest upon mere presumption. Listen to me while I recite some of the principal statutes of the territorial legislature of Kansas, which the senate, differing from the house of representatives, proposes to enforce at the point of the bayonet against citizens of the United States:

"No person who is *conscientiously opposed* to the holding of slaves, or who *does not admit* the right to hold slaves in this territory, shall be a juror in any cause in which the right to hold any person in slavery is involved, nor in any cause in which any injury done to, or committed by, any slave, is in issue, nor in any criminal proceeding for the violation of any law enacted for the protection of slave property, and for the punishment of *crime* committed against the right to such property."

Here is an edict which subverts that old Saxon institution, which is essential and indispensable, not only in all republican systems of government, but even in every free state, whatever may be the form of its government. The question has been asked a thousand times, why does the republican system fail in Spanish America? The answer is truly given as often, that the republican system fails there, because the trial by jury has never existed in Spanish America, and cannot be introduced there.

Lend your ear, if you please, while I repeat another of these statutes of the territory of Kansas:

"*All officers* elected or appointed under any existing or subsequently-enacted laws of this territory, shall take and subscribe the following oath of office: 'I, ———, do solemnly swear, upon the holy Evangelists of Almighty God, that I will *support* the constitution of the United States, and that I will *support and sustain* the provisions of an act entitled "An act to organize the territories of Nebraska and Kansas," and the provisions of the law of the United States commonly known as the "*fugitive slave law*," and faithfully and impartially, and to the best of my ability, demean myself in the discharge of my duties in the office of ——; so help me God.'"

Here is an edict which establishes a test oath, based on political opinion, and, by disfranchising one class of citizens, devolves the government upon another class, and thus subverts that principle of equality, without which no truly republican government has ever existed, or ever can exist.

Excuse me, senators, for calling to your notice a third chapter in the territorial code of Kansas:

"If any free person, *by speaking* or by writing, assert or *maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this territory*, or shall introduce into this territory, print, publish, write, circulate, or cause to be introduced into this territory, written, printed, published, or circulated, in this territory, *any book*, paper, magazine pamphlet, or circular, *containing any denial* of the right of persons to hold slaves in this territory, such person shall be deemed GUILTY OF FELONY, and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than two years."

"If any person *print, write*, introduce into, publish, *or circulate*, or cause to be *brought into*, printed, written, published, or *circulated*, or shall knowingly aid or

assist in bringing into, printing, publishing, or circulating, within this territory, any *book*, *paper*, pamphlet, magazine, hand-bill, or circular, containing any statements, arguments, *opinion*, *sentiment*, doctrine, advice, or inuendo, *calculated* to produce a *disorderly*, dangerous, or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in this territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority, he shall be guilty of felony, and be punished by imprisonment and hard labor for a term not less than five years."

Ever since the debate about the extension of slavery in the territories of the United States began, I have, from year to year, from month to month, and sometimes even from day to day, in this place, and at other posts of public duty, spoken, written, printed, published, and circulated speeches, books, and papers, which constructively would be pronounced felonious, if such a law as this had been in force at the place where that duty was performed. I have not hesitated in the spirit of a free man, and, so far as I can claim such characters, under the responsibilities of a statesman and a Christian, to scatter broadcast over the land, and even throughout the territory of Kansas itself, statements, opinions, and sentiments, which, though designed for a purpose different from that mentioned in this edict, I doubt not would, by prejudiced judicial construction, be held to fall within its inhibition. Whatever other senators may choose to do, I shall not direct the president of the United States to employ a standing army in destroying the fruits of freedom which spring from seeds I have conscientiously sown with my own free hand. This statute, if so you insist on calling it, subverts the liberty of the press and the liberty of speech. Where on earth is there a free government where the press is shackled and speech is strangled? When the republic of France was subverted by the first consul, what else did he do, but shackle the press and stifle speech? When the second Napoleon restored the empire on the ruins of the later republic of France, what else did he do, than to shackle the press and strangle debate? When Santa Anna seized the government of Mexico, and converted it into a dictatorship, what more had he to do than shackle the press and stifle political debate?

Behold, senators, another of these statutes. In the chapter which treats of the writ of *habeas corpus* we have this limitation:

"No negro or mulatto held as a slave within this territory, or lawfully arrested as a fugitive from service from another state or territory, shall be discharged, nor shall his *right of freedom* be had under the provisions of this act."

This is an edict, which suspends the writ of *habeas corpus*. It relates indeed to a degraded class of society, but still the writ which is taken away from that class is the writ of *habeas corpus*, and those who are to be deprived of it by the edict may be freemen. The state that begins with denying the *habeas corpus* to the humblest and most obscure of freemen, will not be long in reaching a more indiscriminate proscription.

It ought to be sufficient objection here, against all these statutes, that they conflict with the constitution of the United States, the highest law recognized in this place. I myself denounce them for that reason, as I denounce them also because they are repugnant to the laws of nature, as recognized by nearly all civilized states.

Pardon, I pray you, senators, the prolixity of the next chapter, which I extract from the Kansas code:

"Every person who may be sentenced by any court of competent jurisdiction, under any law in force within this territory, to punishment by confinement and hard labor, shall be deemed a convict, and shall immediately, under the charge of the keeper of such jail or public prison, or under the charge of such person as the keeper of such jail or public prison may select, be put to hard labor, as in the first section of this act, specified, to wit: 'on the streets, roads, public buildings, or other public works of the territory' (§ 1, page 146); and such keeper or other person, having charge of such convicts, shall cause such convict, while engaged at such labor, to be securely confined by a *chain, six feet in length*, of not less than four-sixteenths nor more than three-eighths of an inch links, with a *round ball of iron*, of not less than four nor more than six inches in diameter, attached, which chain shall be securely fastened to *the ankle* of such convict with a strong lock and key; and such keeper, or other person, having charge of such convict, may, if necessary, confine such convict, while so engaged at hard labor, by *other chains*, or other means, in his discretion, so as to keep such convict secure, and prevent his escape; and when there shall be *two* or more convicts under the charge of such keeper, or other person, such convicts shall be *fastened together* by strong chains, with strong locks and keys, during the time such convicts shall be engaged in hard labor without the walls of any jail or prison."

I have devoted, heretofore, no unimportant part of my life to mitigating the severity of penal codes. The senate of the United States now informs us, that if I desire the privilege of voting for this bill, which is designed to maintain the army of the United States in its integrity, I must consent to send that army into the territory of Kansas, to fasten chains of *iron* six feet long, with balls of *iron* four inches in diameter, with strong locks, upon the limbs of offenders

guilty of speaking, printing and publishing principles and opinions subversive of the system of slavery.

I have no excessive tenderness in regard to taking life or liberty as a forfeiture to the majesty of the laws, for the invasion of the peace and safety of society. Yet I do say, nevertheless, that I regard chains and balls, and all such implements and instruments of slavery, with a detestation so profound, that I will sooner take chains upon my own frame, and wear them through what may remain of my own pilgrimage here, than impose them, even where punishment is deserved, upon the limbs of my fellow men. I cannot consent to go backward, and restore barbarism to the penal code of the United States, even for the sake of an appropriation to maintain the army of the United States for a single year.

The Kansas code rises, as you advance through it, to a climax of inhumanity. Here is the next chapter:

"If any person shall *aid or assist* in enticing, decoying, or *persuading*, or carrying away, or *sending out* of this territory, any slave belonging to another, with intent to procure or effect the freedom of such slave, or with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, and on conviction thereof *shall suffer death*, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years."

Pray tell me, senators, what you think of that? This statute has been promulgated in Kansas, a territory of the United States. It can have become a law there only, directly or indirectly, through the exercise of the legislative power of the congress of the United States. The constitution of the United States confers upon congress no power whatever to consign any human being to a condition of bondage or slavery to another human being; but, on the contrary, prohibits the exercise of a power so inhuman and barbarous.

The constitution of the United States, consequently, confers on congress no power, directly or indirectly, to make it a crime in one man to persuade another, reduced to bondage or slavery, to seek his freedom. I repudiate this pretended law, therefore, and I will not consent to send the army of the United States to Kansas to execute it.

I am here asked, while voting twelve million dollars to support the federal army, to make it a crime against the United States, punishable with death, to persuade a slave to escape from bondage, and to command the army to execute that punishment. I cannot do that.

I call your attention to another of these enactments:

"If any person shall *entice, decoy*, or carry away out of this territory, any slave belonging to another, with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slaves, or with intent to effect or procure the freedom of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, and, on conviction thereof, *shall suffer* DEATH *or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years.*"

There is no larceny of property of any kind which, in my judgment, demands punishment by death. Certainly, I shall not agree to a law which shall inflict that extreme punishment for constructive larceny, in a case where it is at least a disputed point in ethics, whether the offense is *malum in se.*

Here is another chapter:

"If any slave shall commit petit larceny, or shall steal any neat cattle, sheep or hog, or be guilty of any misdemeanor, or other offense punishable under the provisions of this act only by fine or imprisonment in a county jail, or by both such fine and imprisonment, he shall, *instead of such punishment*, be punished, if a male, by stripes on his bare back not exceeding thirty-nine; or, if a female, by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding twenty-one days, or by stripes not exceeding twenty-one, at the discretion of the justice."

With repentance and atonement I may hope to be forgiven for inflicting blows upon the person of a fellow man, equal in strength and vigor to myself. I should have no hope to be forgiven, much less to retain my own self-respect, if, on any occasion, under any circumstances, or upon any pretext, I should ever consent to apply, or authorize another to apply, a lash to the naked back of a weak, defenseless, helpless woman.

Call these provisions which I have recited by what name you will —edicts, ordinances, or statutes—they are the laws which the house of representatives says shall not be enforced in Kansas by the army of the United States. I give my thanks to the house of representatives, sincere and hearty thanks. I salute the house of representatives with the homage of my profound respect. It has vindicated the constitution of my country; it has vindicated the cause of freedom; it has vindicated the cause of humanity. Even though it shall tamely rescind this vindication to-morrow, when it shall come into conflict with the senate of the United States, yet I shall nevertheless regard this proviso, standing in that case only for a single day, as an omen of more earnest and firm legislation in that great forum.

When, hereafter, one shall be looking through the pages of statute laws, affecting the African race, for a period of more than a quarter of a century, he will regard this ephemeral recognition of the equality of men with the affection and hope which the traveler feels when approaching a green spot in the deserts of Arabia. It must be other senators, not I, who shall consent to blast this oasis, and disappoint all the hopes that already are bursting the bud upon it.

Although the fact is clear that the pretended laws in Kansas can only be executed by armed force, and therefore are obnoxious to a presumption that they are founded in injustice; and although those laws, upon searching examination, are found to be subversive of the constitution, and in conflict with all the sentiments of humanity, the whole case of the house of representatives has nevertheless not yet been stated. The proceedings which have hitherto taken place in executing those laws have been unconstitutional in their character, and attended with grinding oppression and cruel severity. The senator from Virginia has asked me whether such laws do not exist in Missouri.

I suppose such laws exist in that state, and in other states. I have this to say for those states, and for the United States, that a federal standing army has never been employed in executing such laws in those states. And how have these atrocious laws been executed in Kansas? The marshal of the territory, an officer dependent on the president of the United States, has enrolled as a volunteer militia, at the expense of the federal treasury, an armed band of professed propagandists of slavery from other states; and this so-called militia, but really unconstitutional regular force, has been converted into a *posse comitatus* to execute these atrocious statutes by intimidation, or by force, as the nature of the resistance encountered seemed to require. This has been the form of executive action. What has been the conduct of the judicial department? Courts of the United States have permitted grand juries to find, and have maintained, indictments unknown to the laws of the United States, to the common law, and to the laws of all civilized countries—an indictment of a tavern as a nuisance, because the political opinions of its lodgers were obnoxious; an indictment of a bridge over a river for a nuisance, because those who passed over it were of opinion that the establishment of slavery in the territory was injurious to its prosperity; indictments even of printing presses as nuisances, because

the political opinions which they promulgated were favorable to the establishment of a free state government. Either with a warrant from the courts, or without a warrant, but with their connivance, bands of soldiers, with arms belonging to the United States, and enrolled under its flag, and directed by its marshal, combining with other bands of armed invaders from without the territory, and without even the pretense of a trial, much less of a judgment, have abated the alleged nuisance of a tavern by leveling it to the ground, and the pretended nuisances of the free presses by casting type, and presses, and compositors' desks, into the Kansas river.

Moreover, when the citizens, whose obedience to these laws was demanded, sought relief in the only constitutional way which remained open to them, by establishing conditionally, and subject to the assent of congress, to be afterwards obtained, a state government, provisional executive officers, and a provisional legislature, indictments for constructive treason were found in the same courts, by packed grand juries, against these provisional executive officers, and a detachment of the army of the United States entered the legislative halls, and expelled the representatives of the people from their seats. During the intense heat of this almost endless summer, a regiment of federal cavalry performs its evolutions in ranging over the prairies of Kansas, holding in its camp, as prisoners under martial law, without bail or mainprize, not less than ten citizens, thus indicted in those federal courts for the pretended crime of constructive treason. The penalty of treason, under the laws of the United States, is death. What chance for justice attends those citizens. I will show you. The judge who is to try them procured the indictments against them, by a charge to a packed grand jury, in these words:

"This territory was organized by an act of congress, and, so far, its authority is from the United States. It has a legislature, elected in pursuance of that organic act. This legislature, being an instrument of congress by which it governs the territory, has passed laws. These laws, therefore, are of *United States authority and making;* and all that resist these laws resist the power and authority of the United States, and are therefore *guilty of high treason.*

"Now, gentlemen, if you find that any persons have resisted these laws, then you *must*, under your oaths, find bills against such persons for high treason. If you find that no such resistance has been made, but that combinations have been formed for the purpose of resisting them, and individuals of influence and notoriety have been aiding and abetting in such combinations, then *must* you still find bills for constructive treason," &c.

What will it avail their defense, before such a court and such a judge, that the constitution of the United States declares, directly and explicitly, that treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort?

Thus you see, senators, that the executive authority, not content with simple oppression, has seized upon the judiciary, and corrupted and degraded it, for the purpose of executing those pretended and intolerable laws of Kansas. The judge who presides in the territorial courts is a creature of the president of the United States, and holds his office by the tenure of executive pleasure. While the sword of executive power is converted in Kansas into an assassin's dagger, the ermine of justice is stained with the vilest of contaminations. What cause is there for surprise, then, in the administration of government in Kansas, under such laws, and in a manner so intolerable, that a civil war has been brought about by affidavits, an armed force has been employed in executing process for contempt, and an unauthorized and illegal detachment is enrolled in the service of the United States, and employed in abating domestic, social, and political institutions, under the name of nuisances? What wonder is it that a city has been besieged with fire and sword, because it was supposed to contain within its dwellings individuals who denied the legality and obligation of the pretended laws? What wonder that a state, a provisional state, erected in harmony with the constitution and with custom, and waiting our assent for admission into the Union, has been subverted by a mingled process of indictments and martial demonstrations against constructive treason? Who can fail to see through the cloud which executive usurpation and judicial misconstruction have raised, for the purpose of covering these transactions in Kansas, that it is devotion to freedom which alone constitutes any crime in that territory, in the view of its judges, its ministerial officers, and of the president of the United States? And that that crime, in whatever way it may be committed, in their judgment, constitutes treason? Who does not see that devotion to freedom, applauded in all the world besides, in Kansas is a crime to be expiated with death?

I have argued thus far, from the nature of the pretended laws of Kansas, and from the cruel and illegal severity with which they are executed. I shall draw my next argument from the want of consti-

tutional authority on the part of the legislature which enacted these laws. The report of the Kansas investigating committee of the house of representatives, consisting of the evidence of witnesses, numbered by hundreds, and biased against the conclusion at which the house of representatives has arrived, has established the fact upon which I insisted in opening this debate, on the ninth of April last, that the legislature of Kansas was chosen, not by the people, but by an armed invasion from adjoining states, which seized the ballot boxes, usurped the elective franchise, and by fraud and force organized a government, thereby subverting the organic law, and the authority of the United States. At another time, and under different circumstances, a single invader, after the manner adopted by Colonel William Walker, in Nicaragua, might have entered the territory of Kansas with an armed force, and established a successful usurpation there. Let me suppose that he had done so, and had promulgated these identical statutes in the name of the territory of Kansas, would you hold, would the senate hold, would the president of the United States hold, that such a government, thus established, was a legal one, and that statutes thus ordained were valid and obligatory? That is the present case. It differs only in this: that in the case supposed, there is a single conqueror, only one local and reckless usurper; while in the case of Kansas, an associated band are the conquerors and usurpers.

The territorial legislature of Kansas stands on the foundations of fraud and force. It attempts to draw over itself the organic law enacted in 1854, but it is equally subversive of the liberties of the people of Kansas, and of that organic law, and of the authority of the United States. The legislature and territorial government of Kansas stand on no better footing than a *coup d'état*, a revolution. When honorable senators from the other side of this chamber tell me that I am leading the people of Kansas into revolution, I fearlessly reply to them that they have stood idly by, and seen a revolution effected there. Doubtless they have acted with a sincerity of purpose and patriotism equal to my own. They see the facts and the tendency of events, in a light different from that in which these facts and transactions present themselves to me. They, therefore, insist upon maintaining that revolution, and giving it the sanction of congress, by authorizing the standing army of the United States to execute the laws which that revolution has promulgated. The

house of representatives, on the contrary, denounces the revolution, and stands upon the authority of the United States; and, for the purpose of putting an end to that revolution and restoring federal authority, insists that these pretended laws shall not be executed. In this great controversy I leave the majority of the senate, and take my stand by the side of the house of representatives. You warn me that, if we do not recognize these revolutionary authorities in Kansas, the territory will be without an organized state at all, and will relapse into anarchy. The house of representatives meets you boldly on that issue, and replies that if there are not laws in force, exclusive of these pretended statutes, adequate to the purposes of civil government in Kansas, they have invited you in two separate bills, which they have sent up here, widely variant in character, but each adapted to the case, to provide for the restoration of regular and constitutional authority in Kansas. One bill proposes to recognize and establish the state of Kansas under the Topeka constitution; and the other proposes to reörganize the territorial legislature, with proper amendments of the organic law. Thus far, you have practically refused to accept either of these propositions. If, when congress shall have adjourned, the result shall be that Kansas is left without the protection of adequate laws and civil authority, look you to that. The responsibility will not rest on me, nor on the house of representatives.

I desire on this great occasion—perhaps the last one of full debate during the present session of congress—to deliver my whole mind upon this important subject. I add, therefore, that the tendency and end—I will not say object—of the revolution which has been effected in Kansas, which has been effected by her conquerors, through the countenance and aid of the president of the United States, are not of such a character as to reconcile me to that revolution. That end is the establishment of human slavery within the territory of Kansas. If I should go with you and the majority of the senate in emasculating this army bill, as it came from the house of representatives, I should thereby show that I was at least indifferent on so great an issue. I could never forgive myself hereafter, when reviewing the course of my public life, if I had assented to inflict upon even the present settlers of Kansas, few and poor, and scattered through its forests and prairies, as they are, what I deem the mischiefs and evils of a system of compulsory labor, excluding,

as we know by experience that it always does, the intelligent labor of free men.

But it is not merely on to-day and on this generation that I am looking. I cannot restrain my eyes from the effort, at least, to penetrate through a period of twenty-five years—of fifty years—of a hundred years—of even two hundred years—so far, at least, as a statesman's vision ought to reach beyond the horizon that screens the future from common observation. All along and through that dimly-explored vista, I see rising up before me hundreds of thousands, millions, even tens of millions, of my countrymen, receiving their fortunes and fates, as they are being shaped by the action of the congress of the United States, in this hour of languor, at the close of a weary day, near the end of a protracted and tedious session. I shall not, indeed, meet them here on the earth, but I shall meet them all on that day when I shall give up the final account of that stewardship which my country has confided to me. If I were now to consent to such an act, with my existing opinions and convictions, the fruit of early patriotic and Christian teachings, matured by reading of history; by observation in states where freedom flourishes as well as in societies where slavery is tolerated; by experience throughout a life which already approaches a climacteric; by travel in my own and foreign lands; by reflection under the discipline of conscience and the responsibilities of duty; by social converse, and by a thousand collisions of debate; I should be obliged, when that last day shall come to me (as it must come to all), to call upon the rocks and the mountains to fall upon me, and crush me and my name, detested then by myself, into that endless oblivion which is the most unwelcome of all evils, real or imaginary, to the thoughts of a generous and illuminated human mind. Policy forbids me to do it. Justice forbids me to do it. Humanity forbids me to do it. And the constitution of my country—wisest of all constitutions—most equal of all constitutions—most humane of all constitutions which the genius of man has ever framed—forbids me to do it.

I have arrived now at another question much debated here, namely, whether the inhibition which is contained in the bill as it came from the house of representatives, and to which the senate objects, is germane to the bill. If that inhibition really has the importance with which I have invested it, then the question, whether it is germane or not, is worthless and trivial.

In an act of such high necessity as the resistance and suppression of revolution subversive of civil government and public liberty, questions of parliamentary form sink into insignificance; but the question *is* germane. It is a normal provision, of a character identical with the bill itself. The bill proposes an appropriation to defray the expenses of the army of the United States for one year, and necessarily contemplates the character and nature of the service in which the army is to be employed. It is framed with such foresight as the house of representatives can exercise of the places where the army shall be employed, whether in the states or in the territories, or in foreign campaigns, and of the nature and character of its employments, whether training in camp, building fortifications, suppressing Indian insurrections, repelling invasions, or carrying the banner of our stars and stripes in conquest over an enemy's battalions in hostile countries. It is confessed that congress, and not the president of the United States, has power to direct the destination and employment of the army in all these respects.

And now what does the provision propose? Simply this: that while it leaves the discretion of the president free exercise to employ the army where he shall think fit in maintaining federal laws, and, consistently with existing statutes, the laws of every state in the Union, and of every territory in the Union, he shall not do this one thing—employ that army in executing the pretended and obnoxious statutes of the usurpation in Kansas. On the point, whether this inhibition is germane to the bill, you, senators, think that you are making an issue with the house of representatives, on which, when you go down before the people, the senate will stand and the house will fall. I know well the conservative power that is lodged in twelve millions of dollars—Spanish-milled dollars; but I know, also, the virtue, the conservative virtue, which resides in the hearts and consciences of twenty-five millions of American freemen. The people of the United States, in this case, will never stop to ask whether the inhibition is germane or not. They are not yet prepared to receive their own money back at your hands, on condition of the surrender of liberty or the denial of justice. But if I grant that the people will stand by you, and condemn the house of representatives, still, in that case, I take my stand with the house of representatives. The American people have a persevering way of correcting to-day their error of yesterday. When the temporary

inconvenience which they shall have suffered from your act of withholding from them the twelve millions of dollars which ought to be disbursed to them through the operations of the army shall have passed away, they will call you to account for the injustice which will have inflicted that injury, and will then vindicate their fidelity to liberty and justice, while sternly bestowing upon you the censure you have provoked.

Whatever may be the decision, early or late, of the American people, the judgment now to be given will go for review to the tribunal of the civilized world. It needs little of either learning or foresight to anticipate the decision of that tribunal on the issue, whether the senate is right in using bayonets and gunpowder to execute unconstitutional and tyrannical laws, tending to carry slavery into free territories, or the house of representatives is right in maintaining the constitution and the universality of freedom?

The whole question of the propriety of the inhibition, hinges on the point whether, under the circumstances, it is necessary. I appeal on that point to the senate itself, to the country, and to the world. Either the inhibition must be continued in the bill, and so take effect, or else the army will be employed to enforce these atrocious laws. Every other effort to defeat and abrogate them has failed. This attempt is the last that can be made. It is, therefore, this remedy for the revolution in Kansas which we must adopt, or no remedy. I go, therefore, with the house of representatives for the inhibition which it proposes.

You reply, that if the house of representatives persevere, the bill will fail, and thus the action of the government will be arrested. But although the house shall persevere in the right, the bill will not fail, and the action of the government will not be arrested, unless the senate shall persevere in the wrong. If both shall persevere, and the action of the government shall be arrested, on whom will the responsibility fall? Must the house necessarily surrender its own convictions and adopt yours, in all cases, whether they are right or wrong? If so, pray tell me, senators, what is the use of a house of representatives at all? The senate will find, if it shall assume the position of defiance against the house, that it has not weakened the strength of the house of representatives, but periled its own.

By the letter of the constitution, the house of representatives has exclusive right to originate all bills for raising revenue. By custom

inherited from Great Britain, and unbroken since the adoption of the federal constitution, the house of representatives exclusively originates all general appropriation bills. This exclusive right and custom of originating general appropriation bills, involves at least an equal right on the part of the house of representatives to limit or direct the application of the moneys appropriated. The house, in view of the revolution inaugurated in Kansas by the president, with the aid of the army of the United States, and maintained by the senate, might lawfully, if in its discretion it should deem such a course expedient, refuse to appropriate any money whatever for the support of the army. The greater includes the less. The house may, therefore, attach the prohibition as a condition of the grant of supplies for the army. The honorable senator from Maine [Mr. FESSENDEN] has sagely said, in the course of his excellent speech, that the house has, by reason of its constitution, a peculiar and superior fitness for passing on the question involved in this debate. Its members are fresh from the people, and they go hence directly to render an account to the people of the administration of the national treasury. We of the senate are so far removed, by the duration of our terms of office, as practically to be in a measure irresponsible. The house of representatives is constituted by direct election by the people themselves. We of the senate are sent here by the legislatures of the respective states. They are great political bodies, and justly represented here as such, to check, if need be, the too volatile action of the people through the house of representatives. But they are corporations, nevertheless, and the senate is a body representing corporations.

Moreover, the senate, by force of its constitution as a council of the president, in appointments to office and in the conduct of foreign affairs, is more readily inclined towards combination with the president, and of course to dependence upon him, than the house of representatives. It is to the house of representatives, therefore, that the people must look, and it is upon that house, and not upon the senate, that the people must rely mainly for the rescue of public liberty, if the time shall ever come when that liberty shall be endangered with design or otherwise, by the exercise of the executive power.

Thus far I have treated this subject as one involving only the interests of the people of the territory of Kansas. But you will see

at once, without any amplification on my part, that you are establishing, by way of precedent, a system of government for not merely that territory, but all the territories, present and future, within the United States. It is worth while to see what that system is. It is the system of popular sovereignty, founded on the abnegation of congressional authority, attempted by the Kansas and Nebraska act of 1854. But it is that system of popular sovereignty, with the principle of popular sovereignty left out, and that of executive power, exercised with fraud and armed force, substituted in its place. Since we have entered upon a career of territorial aggrandizement, as Rome and Britain and Spain did, respectively, we can look forward to no period when what we call territories, but what they called provinces or colonies, will not constitute a considerable part of our dominion, and be a theatre for the exercise of cupidity and the display of ambition. Let congress now effectually resign the territories to military control by the president, or by generals appointed by him, and two more acts will bring this grand national drama of ours to its close. The first of those acts will be the subversion of liberty in the remaining territories, and then, the Rubicon easily passed, the second will be the establishment of an empire on the ruins of the whole republic.

But how is the government to be arrested, even if this army bill should fail through your persevering dissent from the house of representatives? Is the army of the United States indeed and essentially a civil institution, a necessary and indispensable institution, in our republican system? On the contrary, it is an exception, an anomaly, an antagonistic institution, tolerated, but wisely and justly regarded with jealousy and apprehension. We maintain a standing army in time of war, to suppress Indian insurrections, or to repel foreign invasions; and we maintain the same standing army in time of peace, only because it is wise in peace to be prepared for war. But, whether in peace or war, we maintain it not without some measure of hazard to constitutional liberty. Happily the Indian disturbances within our borders have been suppressed; and if they had not been, the smallest measure of gentleness and charity toward the decaying tribes, would more effectually secure the blessings of peace, so far as they are concerned, than the employment of many legions. Happily, also, the dark cloud that seemed gathering over us from the east, when this session commenced in December last, has been

dispersed, and we have now a sure prospect of peace with all foreign nations for many years to come. The army of the United States is therefore immediately useful or necessary now only as a police to execute municipal laws. If the founders of the constitution had been told that, within seventy years from the day on which they laid its solid foundations, a standing army would have been found necessary and indispensable merely to execute municipal laws, they would have turned shuddering away from the massive despotism which they had erected.

Eleven days hence congress will adjourn, and it will come back again one hundred and eight days after that time. No serious disaster, nor even any great public inconvenience, can happen within that period. Congress will be here in ample time to provide, if it shall be necessary, for the public safety, for expelling Great Britain from Central America, for conquering Cuba, and for bringing into subordination any insurrectionary Indian tribes. Everybody will know that every dollar we owe to contractors, purveyors, merchants, makers of gunpowder or muskets, or founders of cannon, as well as every dollar we owe to soldiers or officers, for pay or for rations, is guarantied by the national faith: and on that faith money can be raised without any considerable discount.

And now, what other inconveniences are to result from a failure to pass the army bill? We are told that law and order will be lost, and anarchy will prevail in the territory of Kansas, if the army be not employed there to keep the peace and execute the territorial laws. Look, I pray you, through this report of the investigating committee, drawn out to the length of twelve hundred pages, filled with details of invasions, robberies, mobs, murders and conflagrations, and tell me what anarchy could happen, in the absence of martial law, worse than the anarchy which has marked its establishment in the territory?

Answer me still further, what measure of anarchy could reconcile, or ought to reconcile, American citizens to a surrender of constitutional liberty in any part of the republic?

Answer me further, what is that measure of tranquillity and quiet that a republican people ought to seek, or can wisely enjoy? It is not the dead quiet, the stagnant tranquillity of cowardly submission to usurpation and despotism, but it is just so much of peace, quiet and tranquillity, as is consistent with the preservation of constitu-

tional liberty. It would be a hard alternative; but, if the senate should insist on forcing on me or on the people I represent, the choice between peace under despotism, or turbulence with freedom, then I must say, promptly and fearlessly, give me so much of safety as I can have, and yet remain a freeman, and keep all quiet and all safety beyond that for those who are willing to be slaves.

AUGUST 27, 1856.[1]

If the occasion were not a very grave one, I could find amusement in the dialogue between the senators from Delaware and Louisiana. They come from slaveholding states, and they agree in refusing all aid to us in arresting the extension of slavery in the national territories. They agree, also, in declaring that the prohibition of slavery contained in the Missouri compromise of 1820, was unconstitutional; and they concur also in opinions derogatory of the gentlemen here, whom they, with manifest self-complacency, call free soilers and abolitionists. And yet, even here in our very presence, they make bargains and stipulations as to how and when we, the aforesaid free-soilers and abolitionists, shall debate the questions they choose to raise in the senate. By and by I shall expect to see them dealing even in our *votes* to effect compromises between themselves. They take these liberties with us in our very presence, on the ground that we are fanatics. One of them compliments me at the expense of my associates, by distinguishing me as a leader of the fanatics in the senate.

I shall show you and them what sort of a fanatic, on the subject of slavery, I am. From this statement you can judge of the fanaticism of my associates. I am, with little caution, also accused of treasonable opinions and sentiments. I will show you what sort of traitor I am. Hence you shall judge of the treason of my honored associates. Hear the evidence, and then answer whether we could be convicted even of constructive treason in your pro-slavery courts of Kansas.

The first vote I ever gave in the senate of the United States was one to place at the head of the cabinet of the president of the United States the honorable senator at my right hand [Mr. Clayton], the same who deprecates the reproach of seeming coöperation with free

[1] Speech on the army bill, at the extraordinary session of the senate.

soilers and abolitionists. He has told us to-day that free-soilers are sometimes long-winded. However that may be, we are firm men—men of perseverance—we are sure-footed, we boast little of speed, but we think we shall be found to have bottom. Acting on the same liberal and loyal principle, I afterwards cast a vote here, the effect of which, if it had been sustained by a majority of the senate, would have been to raise the honorable senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN] from the bar of New Orleans, which he so much adorns, to the bench of the supreme court of the United States. That it was not successful was the fault, not of the free soilers here, but of others into whose embraces he has now cast himself, out of horror of those who then were his supporters.

Were those votes disloyal? You accuse me of fanaticism—fanaticism on the subject of slavery. I put the question to you, sir, [Mr. BUTLER]—to you, sir, [Mr. BAYARD]—to you, sir, and you—to every senator from a slave state, to answer, on your word of honor as a senator and a gentleman, when I have given here even one sectional or partisan vote, other than on a question which divided, upon principle, your section and party from my own, and your constituents from the people I represent. Whether the question involved railroads, rivers, harbors, protection on land or on the sea, fortifications or armed force to defend your homes, or your cities, or your coasts, or even the payment of expenses incurred by yourselves alone against uprising Indians or invading foreigners, refer to your records, and cast up into my teeth one solitary sectional or disloyal or fanatical vote I ever gave in the senate of the United States. Nay, more, remove the injunction of secrecy which makes your executive journal a sealed book, and show one vote that I ever gave here, even when yourselves were divided, against any person nominated to any office, by any president of the United States, because he was a slaveholder, or because he belonged to a section of the country or to a party different from my own. My opinions are always maintained here by reason and argument, never by passion, prejudice or retaliation.

Honorable senators are silent. Standing, then, upon the character for equality, for justice and for loyalty, which I have built, to be a sure foundation for myself, I can pardon the sensibilities of those who think that they are to suffer contamination now by an accidental agreement with me upon a question of vital importance to the coun-

try and to the rights of man. The time, you see, has been when such association was not offensive, because it was not useless to them. That time is coming round again. It will have come when the government of our country shall once more be intrusted to an administration which will protect and defend the territories and the states of this Union against force and usurpation, let it come from what quarter it may. Wait, if you please, for that time, now not far distant, I think, and then if my associates and myself prove faithless to our country or to the Union, accuse us of disloyalty and fanaticism.

There are two reasons why a senator might speak to the question now before the senate. First, that if possible he might by argument bring the senate to adopt his own opinion. Second, that failing in this, he might yet exert an influence upon the opinion of the country. Neither of these reasons serve to justify me in speaking. I have already said, during the late session of congress, all that the question demanded from me, with a view to effect either here or elsewhere.

But since I then spake, circumstances have occurred which, in the estimation of the senate, and possibly of the country, require that what was then said shall be reconsidered. The first circumstance is, that the president, not content with the failure of the army bill by a disagreement of the two houses, has assumed the responsibility of convening congress to reconsider that important subject. The second is, that while in one quarter of the senate there is a persistent purpose to defeat the army bill again, unless the house of representatives shall recede, propositions of concession and conciliation are offered in another quarter, while, at the same time, alarms of public danger are sounded in both these quarters, calculated to induce the house of representatives and the minority of the senate to surrender the opinions to which they have hitherto adhered so firmly. Now, for myself, I have to say to the president of the United States, that neither his proclamation nor his special message has affected my judgment or changed my feelings on this great subject in the least. The president has done nothing which has made or will make me take one divergent or even one hesitating step in the line of duty which I marked out for myself at the last session of congress. I do not mean to say that he is a bad man, but I do say, upon the responsibility of a senator, and as a member of congress, the grand inquest of the nation, that he is an unjust and tyrannical magistrate. At the last session I found him employing all his vast and almost

boundless power and influence, as a civil magistrate and the head of the army, to establish not merely unjust, unconstitutional and tyrannical laws, but even an armed foreign and seditious usurpation in the territory of Kansas, organized for the purpose of subverting constitutional liberty, and establishing unconstitutional and despotic slavery there. When called to account for that gross violation of duty, the president avowed and justified that usurpation. The house of representatives, unable to obtain an agreement from the senate on any adequate measure to overturn that usurpation, and restore constitutional freedom in the territory of Kansas, as a last resource inserted in the army bill a provision which practically prohibits the president from employing the army of the United States to enforce the tyrannical laws of that unconstitutional and despotic usurpation. The senate refused even that small act of grace to the people of Kansas; so the army bill failed. That is the true state of the case made up by the house of representatives and the senate at the late session of congress, and that is the true state of the case between the two houses as it exists now at this extra session.

Now to the case thus stated. If the laws of that usurpation were as just and humane as they are confessedly unjust and barbarous, I still, deeming them the edicts of a usurpation, of an armed usurpation, would not give the president men, materials of war, or money, to enforce even one of them. I know the value of peace and order and tranquillity. I know how essential they are to prosperity, not to say enterprise. But I know also the still greater value of liberty. When you hear me justify the despotism of the czar of Russia over the oppressed Poles, or the treachery by which Louis Napoleon rose to a throne on the ruins of the republic in France, on the ground that he preserves domestic peace among his subjects, then you may expect me to vote supplies of men and money to the president of the United States to execute the edicts of the Missouri borderers in the territory of Kansas.

Next for the alarms which are sounded forth throughout the halls of congress. The president raises the key-note, by striking upon the fertile string of Indian depredations. The honorable and venerable senator from Michigan chimes it. Never, in his eventful life, has he seen a period so portentous. And the honorable senator from Delaware seriously gives forth the prediction that the army must be disbanded, and the Union itself fall asunder. It is a piece of execra-

tive stage management. Congress is called back into the theatre, the curtain rises slowly, amid the jarring discords which make the thunder of the political play-house, and then the air is filled with signs and ghastly spectres. I do not doubt that honorable senators are sincere. I know that sincerity is easier and more practicable than dissimulation, to all mankind. It is easier and more natural to me, and therefore I know it is more natural to others. I therefore hold (as a general truth) that all men are sincere and honest; and I hold him to be merely a fool, who esteems me to be otherwise. But these sincere senators may dismiss their fears. They have been here now nearly nine months. In this senate chamber the atmosphere has become thick, unwholesome and oppressive. We are like an animal inclosed in an exhausted receiver. The fresh, pure air, such as pervades the country, is exhausted, and we are pining, suffering and suffocating. No wonder that the light grows dim, strange and unnatural noises rumble in our ears, the pillars of the capitol seem to us to be tottering, and the very stars of heaven appear to be shooting from their spheres. Our imagination is diseased by unwholesome confinement. That is all.

On the fatal day, the 18th day of August, when at high noon this congress adjourned, I too went forth from the senate chamber, haunted by spectres of discord which threatened to rend this country asunder, because the army bill had failed; and these spectres pursued me along the avenues and humbler pathways to my quiet dwelling on the bank of the Potomac. Then I sat down to meditate on that mighty and fearful ruin which I had been warned was to fall on the capital and on the country, in swift revenge of the failure of the army bill. The evening shades gathered around me, but they brought no notes or signs of sorrow, fear or sadness. The parlors of my neighbor on the right resounded with the tinkling of the guitar. Fairy-footed children were dancing in the halls of my neighbor on the left, to the merriest notes the violin could breathe through its mirth-moving strings. Across the way, the Russian minister, always watchful of portents of dissension here, worthy the notice of his sovereign, was entertaining a joyous company in his lordly halls, as undisturbed by the crashing and falling of this great republic over his head, as the deaf mutes, who, on the opposite side of the way, were joining with happier youths than themselves in the amusements of the eventide. And, though it is strange, it is never-

theless true, that this condition of happy ignorance of political evil or danger has continued in that neighborhood ever since.

The state of the case is very different here in the senate chamber. You can understand the reality of this great ruin. Senators, you can repeat it to each other; you can impress each other with the truth of its existence. You can even produce conviction of that fearful fact upon the galleries. They are filled with your clients. The streets around the capitol are filled with them. They perhaps will groan, or would, if it were respectful to do so, when I express a doubt whether the ruin is not exaggerated in your speeches. But, senators, do not let their sympathy mislead and deceive you. They are interested clients and dependents. They all have long arms and wide-spreading fingers, to dip, by your gracious permission, into the treasury, but no strong shoulders to support and bear up the constitution of their country. If you rely on their applause and their sympathies, and go down with us before the people upon this issue, you may look out at the next session of congress for galleries filled with other clients just as patriotic, but, at the same time, just as well satisfied that this country can only be saved from ruin by an administration of the government which will overturn the Missouri usurpation, and restore "perfect freedom" to the people of Kansas. I know something of the temper of legislative galleries, and of the atmosphere of executive chambers. I warn you not to rely too much on the purity of the one, or the constancy of the other.

So, this executive stage effect, then, does not change my resolution. What next occurs, to affect it? A by-play is gotten up between two of the three parties in this house, who assume to act in the name of all. In a parliamentary sense, there are three parties here: 1st, the democracy; 2d, a branch of the opposition once known as whigs (now, I fear to give offense by using a misnomer, and therefore do not name it); and, 3d, the republicans, black republicans, or abolitionists, as the other two parties happily agree in calling us who constitute the other, and far the largest branch of the opposition. But, although there are three parties here, yet, when it comes to a question of dividing the house into its three constituent parts, the figure 2 is always used as a divisor; and the democracy and the aforesaid nameless band of the opposition are found together, and the republicans stand alone, in contrast to both. Just now, however, the two first stand apart, and an interlude of conciliation

and pacification is enacted between their representatives, the senators from Delaware and Louisiana. We republicans are allowed to appear as supernumeraries, not in original parts of our own, but just to give greater effect to the scenes. The senator from Delaware presents a bill—for which all the republicans are to vote, without offering amendments or debate—for repealing certain obnoxious laws in Kansas; and the senator from Louisiana presses the democracy in the senate to pass that bill. Then the house of representatives is to be deemed refractory, if they do not at once yield their proviso, and pass the army bill. Thus, this pretty little interlude, like the one gotten up by the clowns of Athens, that is incorporated into the Midsummer's Night Dream, happily moves forward the grand plot of the drama to a successful denouement. Certainly, I do not mean to assign to those distinguished senators the parts belonging to any of the subordinates in the interlude. I recognize him from Delaware as Oberon, the king of an imaginary realm, and him from Louisiana as the sprightly and yet efficient Ariel, prime minister to that gracious but unequally-tempered sovereign. But, alas! the interlude drags. It does not advance the action of the grand plot, nor can it proceed itself. Democratic senators, especially the stern and inflexible senator from Virginia, refuses to concur in giving the necessary assent of the democratic part of the house to the conciliation bill; and we republican senators cannot pass this bill of conciliation, even if we would. The two senators who get it up are sure only of their own votes, reïnforced by ours. But, let us suppose that they bring their interlude to a happy termination. It is a rule in courts of equity, in furtherance of justice, that what ought to be done shall be taken to have been done. We will suppose that this bill of conciliation, which abrogates certain of the obnoxious laws of Kansas, has passed; and thereupon I am asked to vote for the army bill, without the proviso of the house of representatives. I cannot do it. The objection to it remains just as before. Your bill does not remove all the unconstitutional and despotic laws of Kansas. The executive courts in Kansas will deny that it removes any of them, and, above all, the usurpation in Kansas. The forge in which those tyrannical laws were made remains in full blast, to produce others as tyrannical as these. There is nothing in this new and ingenious device to change my purpose, and nothing, as I trust, to alter the fixed purpose of the house of representatives.

What next? You come back to argument. You assert that the course of the house of representatives, in insisting upon this proviso, is unconstitutional and revolutionary. My excellent friend from Massachusetts, in his very able speech, has given you the authority of the Federalist for the very power which the house of representatives is thus exercising.

The honorable senator from Louisiana breathed on those quotations from the Federalist, and they disappeared. He is an ingenious and eloquent advocate. When I saw this bar of iron, so rough and black when cold, come out from between his hammer and the anvil, it seemed perfectly smooth and sparkling. But now, when it has cooled again, it is just as rough and black as it was before. He argued that the power of the house of representatives to annex a condition to a money bill, was confined to the single case when the senate should refuse its consent to an apportionment bill for raising the number of representatives of the people with the advance of population. Now, a simple reading of the text will convict him of error:

"These considerations seem to afford ample security on this subject (namely, a conflict in case of augmentation of the number of members of the house of representatives), and ought alone to satisfy all the doubts and views which have been indulged in regard to it. Admitting, however, that they should all be insufficient to subdue the unjust policy of the smaller states, or their predominant influence in the councils of the senate, a constitutional and infallible resource still remains with the larger states, by which they will be able at all times to accomplish (what?) *their just purposes.*"

At what *time* to accomplish? At *all times*, to accomplish their just purposes. Not at one time, one particular purpose only, but at all times, *all* their *just purposes*. Then the house of representatives may have more than one *just purpose*. If more than one just purpose can be indulged, then the provision is a general one, and applies to all such just purposes; and of the justice of any purpose, as well as of the necessity of resorting to the extreme remedy to accomplish it, the house of representatives, as a coördinate branch of the legislature, has equal right with the senate to judge. I think this a sufficient reply on that subject.

And now, to treat more seriously than I have yet done the argument that the army must and will be disbanded, and that the country will be abandoned to desolating Indian depredations. You will

remember that this constitutes the whole, or nearly the whole, argument of the president's message. The picture is drawn, I suppose, from between the covers of the school-books of past generations. Senators enlarge. They tell us that the war in Florida, waged, as we know it is, by only two hundred or three hundred poor straggling Indians of that peninsula, is not yet ended. Well, it has lasted more than fifteen years; and if it has not yet been suppressed by the army, which has at all times been well supplied, in Heaven's name when will it end? Would it be unwise to change our policy, and try to bring it to an end without an army? They tell us that Texas is suffering from Indian depredations; and yet, at this moment, the state of Texas is sending armed colonists to join in the subjugation of Kansas. They insist that Indian wars are yet raging in California and Oregon, although General Wool writes to me that the war is ended, and would have been brought to a close much sooner, but for the misconduct of the civil authorities there; while those civil authorities are sending creditors to us, with accounts amounting to four millions of dollars advanced to subsist the militia in their successful efforts at restoring peace and safety in those regions.

Thus, you see that these pretenses of danger from the Indians are all moonshine, let in upon the senate through artfully prepared crevices in the walls of the executive palace.

And now a word in serious earnestness on the subject of the alarms about the Union. If there is danger of its dissolution, it must be discoverable in some quarter. There must be somewhere an enemy to his country and to her constitution. Where is he—who is he? Who is it, where is the man, that proposes to scuttle this noble ark of the constitution, that has rode the waves so gently in times of calm, so proudly in season of storms and tempests, and sink it into the depths of the sea, while he will transfer us, for safety, to some gay-gilded fantastical craft of his own handiwork? There is no such man in this country, in the north or in the south, in the east or in the west. We are all on board together, and all equally watchful of our course, and jealous indeed of the pilot whom we station at the helm. These attempted alarms about the safety of the Union are factitious. Congress adjourned on the 18th of August, without passing the army bill, and yet the country and the constitution remained safe; for we found them so on the

21st. Congress may adjourn to-morrow, to reassemble on the first Monday of December next, and we shall find the country and the constitution then just as safe as they are now. What will happen, will be simply this: You, the senate, will go down before the people on the issue which you have made with the house of representatives. That issue will be tried. If the two houses, after hearing the popular verdict, shall be unable to agree when they come together at the next session in December, take my word for it, they will certainly agree at the first session of the newly-elected congress afterwards.

Now this is just what the constitution contemplates, and what congresses are made for. They are not made to agree always. The two houses must agree, when they can agree in principle. They must differ, when the flames of truth that burn in their consciences give out lights of differing hues. The conflict in such cases is necessarily inconvenient; but it is temporary, and is necessary to the true ascertainment and establishment of truth. In such occasional conflicts dwells the safety, not the danger, of the republic—the safety, not the peril, of the Union. On the contrary, danger, to both will be found the most serious, and the most imminent, when the three main departments of the government—the senate, the house of representatives, and the president—shall unite and concur in establishing, by force, revolution, usurpation and slavery in the territories of the United States. When that shall happen, *then* look out for the safety of the states, the pillars of the Union, and for the liberties that dwell in that noblest of all edifices raised by human hands.

I am appealed to, to yield before the terrors of civil war. I am conjured to surrender my positions by the love which I bear to peace and harmony. I do indeed love peace; I do indeed fear the terrors of civil war; but that is not enough to make me surrender an object more important than peace—liberty. Peace! The senate will give peace to Kansas now on one condition—that Kansas will surrender freedom, and accept slavery. Is there anything new in this proposition? Is it not the very proposition that you made when you passed the Kansas-Nebraska law? If the people of Kansas would have accepted slavery, they could have had peace at the hands of congress eighteen months ago, and there would never have been a marauder, or even a hostile intruder, from Missouri, within the territory. They have always had the option of peace;

they have it now, independently of you; they have only to strike the colors of freedom, and run up the black flag of slavery, and thereupon peace, order, and tranquillity, will reign throughout the prairies they have chosen for their abode. Aye, and the longer that slavery shall last there, down to that period, I know not how distant, when the African race itself shall rise to assert its own wrongs, the surer and more profound will be the peace that will prevail there.

Now, even if the people of Kansas were willing to strike the flag of freedom, which they have defended through so many perils, I have yet to say, that I am a representative of one of the states of this Union that claims the right to maintain the balance of freedom in this council chamber of the states. I want Kansas here a free state. New York wants her to come here free, if she shall enter the confederacy at all. We may as well come directly to this issue, then. You want Kansas organized as a slave state, and you will give her peace if she will accept slavery; if she do not accept slavery, she must take war, with its dangers and its desolations.

Senators propose this condition as if it were a new one, offered now for the first time. They express surprise that I am not alarmed, when they tell me that civil war, except on the condition of slavery, is inevitable and imminent. There was civil war in Kansas when we assembled here in December; a military revolution had been effected there, an armed usurpation was established there, and there was opposition and resistance to it; there was commotion, strife, bloodshed, then and there. Every day the tragedy has been advancing steadily in the development of the horrors of civil war. Just as soon as I could get the vantage ground of the Topeka constitution to stand upon, I called your attention to the existence of that civil war, explained its causes, and with all the fervency that not merely love of peace, but love of liberty also, could enkindle, I conjured you to arrest it before it was too late, by removing the cause of that civil war. Even now, senators refer to the appeals I then made, so truthfully, as exaggerations of a fertile imagination. Such was the answer you then gave me; and now the answer you give me, now when I conjure you once more, and more earnestly than ever, to arrest fratricidal strife, by admitting Kansas under her own free constitution, is, that that constitution must be surrendered, or the flames of civil war must be suffered to burn with new intensity throughout that ill-fated territory.

It is true that I see a new campaign preparing in that quarter. But, just like those which have occurred there before, it is a campaign not organized by the citizens of Kansas against each other, nor yet organized by emigrants sent thither by the Massachusetts emigrant aid society, but by invaders who are going forth from all or many of the slave states, to extirpate the freemen of Kansas, to seize upon the ballot-boxes by force to usurp the elective franchise, to create in that way a new legislature and a convention that will organize a slave state, which even this congress is expected to receive with open arms as a member of this federal republic. During all the period of that civil war that has been prevailing in Kansas, the armed bands that have demolished hotels, sacked cities, overturned free presses, mobbed ministers of the gospel, and slain the farmer while inclosing his newly-marked field on the prairie, and the "perfectly free" immigrant before he had slept one night in the territory which he had chosen for his home, were not citizens of Kansas, or adventurers from the free states.

The armed bands that are forming along the banks of the Missouri, and in the cities of the southern slave states, to renew the violence so briefly suspended, are of the same class. I need not be told here how desperate and reckless they are. Honorable senators mistake me much, if they suppose that I look with complacency or calmness on the gathering of the storm anew, and that I do not fear for the safety of the people upon whom it is so soon to rain down new desolation. Why should I not share all their alarms and fears? They are my neighbors, countrymen, and friends. But, at the same time, honorable senators, in explaining their own positions in this crisis, will not disturb me by imputing to me responsibilities for the disasters of the times. Before the so-called compromise of 1850 was enacted here, there was neither civil war in Kansas, nor any cause existing that could ever produce civil war or slavery there. I expostulated against the compromise, and implored congress not to disturb the landmarks of freedom. I was answered, that those landmarks of freedom were in that case a mere abstraction, on which it was only fanaticism and folly to insist. I replied, that if you yielded that abstraction, and so tolerated slavery in the possessions acquired from Mexico, that slavery would invade the unoccupied territory which remained under the protection of the Missouri compromise of 1820, and that it would crowd you out of all the territo-

ries of the United States, and engage you in a contest for freedom, even in the free states. The concessions then demanded were nevertheless made.

In 1854, you took advantage of the concessions made in 1850, and proposed an abrogation of the prohibition of slavery contained in the compromise of 1820, under the specious pretense of abnegating all federal authority concerning slavery over the territories of the United States, and granting to the people in those territories perfect freedom to establish civil liberty there for themselves. I remonstrated and expostulated again, and warned you then that you were sending the demon of civil strife into the territories. You persisted. At the beginning of this session, I directed your attention to the civil war then actually broken out in Kansas, and implored your interposition to restore peace there, together with that perfect freedom which had been subverted by the invaders. The civil war was then there; it remains there yet; it only grows more and more flagrant. What evil has happened, then, that I have not foreseen and endeavored to prevent? Who has held executive power in this land? Certainly not I. Who has exercised legislative power? Certainly not I. Who judicial authority? Certainly not I. Whose counsels have directed executive, legislative, and judicial powers? Certainly not mine, but the counsels of those who have been constantly my adversaries. Yet there is civil war in Kansas, and it is the result of unwise and pernicious legislation, tyrannical executive action, and prostituted judicial authority. He whose penetration no secret of the human heart escapes, no artful perversion of the truth baffles—He who makes the hearts of men to love freedom even more than peace, and to seek it with untiring perseverance throughout ages of suffering—He knows where the responsibility of the disasters that have overtaken the republic belongs. My conscience, on this subject, shrinks not from His awful scrutiny.

And now, as I have heretofore counseled how to continue the reign of peace before it was broken, and how to restore it when first it was broken, I will, with deference, advise how to regain its sway, before it is too late, and before the whole country rages with the flames hitherto confined within the limits of Kansas. You can do this only by removing the cause of the civil war in Kansas, the revolutionary usurpation that exists there. In short, you can only effectually restore peace to Kansas, and harmony to the country, by

granting liberty, with new and sure safeguards. What Kansas wants, is not merely peace, but that perfect freedom and safety which you granted, or professed to grant, by the Kansas and Nebraska law. You must not merely repeal the laws of the conquerors of Kansas, but you must abolish the conquest itself. There is only one alternative—which is, that Missourians will irrigate the soil of Kansas with the blood of its people, to fertilize that soil, and make it receive the seeds of slavery. Consider well, I beseech you, what a fearful alternative, how horrible an alternative, this is! And consider—alas, that I must urge it—how dangerous a one it is! All the principles of our constitution, all the sentiments of mankind, all nature itself revolts against it. Can it, then, be adopted with success and safety? Let the trial, if it must come, determine. Some senator asks, who can tell what is to be the destiny of Kansas? I can tell. I do not know the fearful horrors through which either Kansas or the country is to pass; but be they what they may, the destiny of Kansas is freedom.

I turn, for a moment, to the honorable senator from Kentucky [Mr. CRITTENDEN]. He has laid his peace-offering on the table of the senate—I ought rather to say, "on the altar of his country." His years, his eminent position, his unquestioned patriotism, entitle him to do so, and entitle him not merely to forbearance on this occasion, but to the homage due to one who sincerely desires to be a public benefactor. Although he has not spoken so charitably of me as might become the office he has undertaken, I shall not attempt to thrust that offering from the altar, or to tear it into pieces. I will let it lie there, and calmly await the approval of it by the slave states, in whose name it is presented by him, as one with which the free states ought also to be satisfied. The slave states have committed themselves to the principle of popular sovereignty in the territories so deeply, that they uphold and maintain even a revolutionary and usurping authority there as a legitimate one. We shall see whether they are ready, on the prayer of the senator from Kentucky, to renounce this principle and its acceptable fruits, and transfer the legislative authority in Kansas to any depository which will restore either perfect freedom, or any real freedom whatever, to the people of Kansas. I will wait and answer, after the democracy on the other side of the chamber shall have recognized the senator's peace-offering as their own. In the meantime, I beg to say, with the

highest respect and the utmost kindness to the honorable senator who leads in this solemn ceremony, that he is not likely to effect a truce with the house of representatives by such denunciations as he has indulged in against the free states of the north on this occasion. No; to resume his own figure, let me tell him that the priest who shall, in this conjuncture, lay on the altar of his country a peace-offering acceptable to the American people, must be a man who not only loves public tranquillity and is without fear, but who also can respect the love of justice and truth and the devotion to freedom which animate the free states of the north.

The honorable senator, after deploring the fanaticism of the north announces his hope that it will grow more conciliatory. It is not the character of the north star to change its position or to vary its light. The mariner singles it out from among all the luminaries of the heavens, and adopts it as the guide to his course, for its constancy. It will not change now. It has been for a time partially covered with fleeting clouds; but they are passing away, and it will stand then and shine steadily upon this nation, until it shall conduct not only those states which receive its vertical rays, but even those which enjoy only its angular beams, into the haven of impartial and enduring freedom. The Romans in their southern capital, and under their sunny skies, thought, when the Northmen for a time withdrew from the borders of the city, that those Northmen would change and relent, and become more conciliatory. Did the Northmen indeed change? No, not until they had mingled their own blood with the blood of Italy, and restored it to a better and purer freedom than it had ever known before.

I think that France and England, and especially Turkey, is expecting that the north of Europe will become more conciliatory, more generous. Do you believe this? No; the north of Europe changes not. It is again to spread over the southern plains, and reïnvigorate the natives of the Mediterranean. No more will the north of America change. You may resist it if you will, but it will persevere peacefully, if you will suffer it to do so; but it will persevere constantly, nevertheless, in the extension of freedom in the territories of the United States, and by its example in inducing the southern states to abolish slavery among themselves.

And, now, what do senators expect to gain by persisting in the miserable issue they have made up with the house of representa-

tives?—an issue upon our own relative power, under the constitution, as a branch of the national legislature—a question merely personal. I have no reason to despise, as I have no motive to undervalue, the power or the dignity of the senate of the United States. Contrary to what I had ever before expected or dreamed, I, myself, am a member of the senate. My own fortunes and fame, such as they are, are bound up in the fortunes and fame of the senate. For me there is no higher ambition than the place I hold in the senate; there is no lane or open way for me to any other department of my country's service. As I would leave a fair name, and, if possible, one that might in future times arrest the eye of the curious and inquisitive student who shall be prying into my country's history, so I am careful never to do an act, to speak a word, or think a thought, unbecoming to the senate of the United States. I therefore stand with you all for the dignity, and honor, and independence, of the senate. But I confess to you frankly my opinion, that the senate will defend its dignity and independence effectually, not by joining puerile issues with the house of representatives on questions of equality or preëminence, but in the same way that every citizen, who is a constituent of either house of congress, maintains his dignity and independence—namely, by doing justice, loving mercy, and walking humbly, under all the vicissitudes and in all the scenes of human activity and endurance.

FREEDOM IN KANSAS.[1]

EIGHT years ago we slew the Wilmot proviso in the senate chamber, and buried it with triumphal demonstrations under the floors of the capitol. Four years later, we exploded altogether the time-honored system of governing the territories by federal rules and regulations, and published and proclaimed in its stead a new gospel of popular sovereignty, whose ways, like those of wisdom, were to be ways of pleasantness, and all of whose paths were supposed to be flowery paths of peace. Nevertheless, the question whether there shall be slavery or no slavery in the territories, is again the stirring passage of the day. The restless proviso has burst the cerements of the

[1] Speech in the Senate, March 3, 1858, on the Lecompton constitution. See *ante* page 30.

grave, and, striking hands here in our very presence with the gentle spirit of popular sovereignty, run mad, is seen raging freely in our halls, scattering dismay among the administration benches, in both houses of congress. Thus an old and unwelcome lesson is read to us anew. The question of slavery in the federal territories, which are the nurseries of future states, independently of all its moral and humane elements, involves a dynastical struggle of two antagonistical systems, the labor of slaves and the labor of freemen, for mastery in the Federal Union. One of these systems partakes of an aristocratic character; the other is purely democratic. Each one of the existing states has staked, or it will ultimately stake, not only its internal welfare, but also its influence in the federal councils, on the decision of that contest. Such a struggle is not to be arrested, quelled or reconciled, by temporary expedients or compromises.

I always engage reluctantly in these discussions, which awaken passion just in the degree that their importance demands the impartial umpirage of reason. This reluctance deepens now, when I look around me and count the able contestants who have newly entered the lists on either side; and shadowy forms of many great and honored statesmen who once were eloquent in these disputes, but whose tongues have since become stringless instruments, rise up before me. It is, however, a maxim in military science, that in preparation for war, every one should think as if the last event depended on his counsel, and in every great battle each one should fight as if he were the only champion. The principle perhaps is equally sound in political affairs. If it be possible, I shall perform my present duty in such a way as to wound no just sensibilities. I must, however, review the action of presidents, senates and congresses. I do indeed, with all my heart, reject the instruction given by the Italian master of political science, which teaches that all men are bad by nature, and that they will not fail to show this depravity whenever they have a fair opportunity. But jealousy of executive power is a high, practical virtue in republics; and we shall find it hard to deny the justice of the character of free legislative bodies, which Charles James Fox drew, when he said that the British house of commons, of which he was at the moment equally an ornament and an idol, like every other popular assembly, must be viewed as a mass of men capable of too much attachment and too much animosity, capable of being biased by weak and even wicked motives,

and liable to be governed by ministerial influence, by caprice, and by corruption.

I propose to inquire, in the first place, why the question before us is attended by real or apparent dangers.

I think our apprehensions are in part due to the intrinsic importance of the transaction concerned. Whenever we add a new column to the federal colonnade, we need to lay its foundation so firmly, to shape its shaft with such just proportions, to poise it with such exactness, and to adjust its connections with the existing structure so carefully, that instead of falling prematurely, and dragging other and venerable columns with it to the ground, it may stand erect forever, increasing the grandeur and the stability of the whole massive and imperial fabric. Still, the admission of a new state is not necessarily or even customarily attended by either embarrassments or alarms. We have already admitted eighteen new states without serious commotions, except in the cases of Missouri, Texas and California. We are even now admitting two others, Minnesota and Oregon; and these transactions go on so smoothly that only close observers are aware that we are thus consolidating our dominion on the shores of lake Superior, and almost at the gates of the Arctic ocean.

It is possible that the apprehended difficulties in the present case have some relation to the dispute concerning slavery, which is raging within the territory of Kansas. Yet it must be remembered that nine of the new states which have been admitted, expressly established slavery, or tolerated it, and nine of them forbade it. The excitement, therefore, is due to peculiar circumstances. I think there are three of them, namely:

First. That whereas, in the beginning, the ascendency of the slave states was absolute, it is now being reversed.

Second. That whereas, heretofore, the national government favored this change of balance from the slave states to the free states, it has now reversed this policy, and opposes the change.

Third. That national intervention in the territories, in favor of slave labor and slave states, is opposed to the natural, social and moral developments of the republic.

It seems almost unnecessary to demonstrate the first of these propositions. In the beginning, there were twelve slave states, and only one that was free. Now, six of those twelve have become

free; and there are sixteen free states to fifteen slave states. If the three candidates now here, Kansas, Minnesota and Oregon, shall be admitted as free states, then there will be nineteen free states to fifteen slave states. Originally, there were twenty-four senators of slave states, and only two of a free state; now there are thirty-two senators of free states, and thirty of slave states. In the first constitutional congress, the slave states had fifty-seven representatives, and the one free state had only eight; now, the free states have one hundred and forty-four representatives, while the slave states have only ninety. These changes have happened in a period during which the slave states have almost uninterruptedly exercised paramount influence in the government, and notwithstanding the constitution itself has opposed well-known checks to the relative increase of representation of free states. I assume, therefore, the truth of my first proposition.

I suggested a second circumstance, namely: That whereas, in the earlier age of the republic, the national government favored this change, yet it has since altogether reversed that policy, and it now opposes the change. I do not claim that heretofore the national government always, or even habitually, intervened in the territories in favor of the free states, but only that such intervention preponderated. While slavery existed in all of the states but one, at the beginning, yet it was far less intense in the northern than in some of the southern states. All of the former contemplated an early emancipation. The fathers seem not to have anticipated an enlargement of the national territory. Consequently, they expected that all the new states to be thereafter admitted would be organized upon subdivisions of the then existing states, or upon divisions of the then existing national domain. That domain lay behind the thirteen states, and stretched from the lakes to the gulf, and was bounded westward by the Mississippi. It was naturally divided by the Ohio river, and the northwest territory and the southwest territory were organized on that division. It was foreseen, even then, that the new states to be admitted would ultimately overbalance the thirteen original ones. They were, however, mainly to be yet planted and matured in the desert, with the agency of human labor.

The fathers knew only of two kinds of labor, the same which now exist among ourselves—namely, the labor of African slaves and the labor of freemen. The former then predominated in this

country, as it did throughout the continent. A confessed deficiency of slave labor could be supplied only by domestic increase, and by continuance of the then existing importation from Africa. The supply of free labor depended on domestic increase, and a voluntary immigration from Europe. Settlements, which had thus early taken on a free-labor character or a slave-labor character, were already maturing in those parts of old states which were to be ultimately detached and formed into new states. When new states of this class were organized, they were admitted promptly, either as free states or as slave states, without objection. Thus Vermont, a free state, was admitted in 1791; Kentucky, a slave state, in 1792; and Tennessee, also a slave state, in 1796. Five new states were contemplated to be erected in the northwest territory. Practically it was unoccupied, and therefore open to labor of either kind. The one kind or the other, in the absence of any anticipated emulation, would predominate, just as congress should intervene to favor it. Congress intervened in favor of free labor. This indeed was an act of the continental congress, but it was confirmed by the first constitutional congress. The fathers simultaneously adopted three other measures of less direct intervention. First, they initiated in 1789, and completed in 1808, the absolute suppression of the African slave trade. Secondly, they organized systems of foreign commerce and navigation, which stimulated voluntary immigration from Europe. Thirdly, they established an easy, simple and uniform process of naturalization. The change of the balance of power from the slave states to the free states, which we are now witnessing, is due chiefly to those four early measures of national intervention in favor of free labor. It would have taken place much sooner, if the borders of the republic had remained unchanged. The purchase of Louisiana and the acquisition of Florida, however, were transactions resulting from high political necessities, in disregard of the question between free labor and slave labor. In admitting the new state of Louisiana, which was organized on the slave-labor settlement of New Orleans, congress practised the same neutrality which it had before exercised in the states of Kentucky and Tennessee. No serious dispute arose until 1819, when Missouri, organized within the former province of Louisiana, upon a slave-labor settlement in St. Louis, applied for admission as a slave state, and Arkansas was manifestly preparing to appear soon in the same character. The balance of power between

the slave states and the free states was already reduced to an equilibrium, and the eleven free states had an equal representation with the eleven slave states in the senate of the United States. The slave states unanimously insisted on an unqualified admission of Missouri. The free states, with less unanimity, demanded that the new state should renounce slavery. The controversy seemed to shake the Union to its foundations, and it was terminated by a compromise. Missouri was admitted as a slave state. Arkansas, rather by implication than by express agreement, was to be admitted, and it was afterwards admitted as a slave state. On the other hand, slavery was forever prohibited in all that part of the old province of Louisiana yet remaining unoccupied, which lay north of the parallel of 36° 30′ north latitude. The reservation for free labor included the immense region now known as the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, and seemed ample for eight, ten, or more free states. The severity of the struggle and the conditions of the compromise, indicated very plainly, however, that the vigor of national intervention in favor of free labor and free states was exhausted. Still, the existing statutes were adequate to secure an ultimate ascendency of the free states.

The policy of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave states began with the further removal of the borders of the republic. I cheerfully admit that this policy has not been persistent or exclusive, and claim only that it has been and yet is predominant. I am not now to deplore the annexation of Texas. I remark simply that it was a bold measure, of doubtful constitutionality, distinctly adopted as an act of intervention in favor of slave labor, and made or intended to be made most effective by the stipulation that the new state of Texas may hereafter be divided and so reörganized as to constitute five slave states. This great act cast a long shadow before it—a shadow which perplexed the people of the free states. It was then that a feeble social movement, which aimed by moral persuasion at the manumission of slaves, gave place to political organizations, which have ever since gone on increasing in magnitude and energy, directed against a further extension of slavery in the United States. The war between the United States and Mexico, and the acquisition of the Mexican provinces of New Mexico and Upper California, the fruits of that war, were so immediately and directly consequences of the annexation of Texas, that all of those transactions in fact may

be regarded as constituting one act of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave states. The field of the strife between the two systems had become widely enlarged. Indeed, it was now continental. The amazing mineral wealth of California stimulated settlement there into a rapidity like that of vegetation. The Mexican laws which prevailed in the newly acquired territories, dedicated them to free labor, and thus the astounding question arose for the first time, whether the United States of America, whose constitution is based on the principle of the political equality of all men, would blight and curse with slavery a conquered land which enjoyed universal freedom. The slave states denied the obligation of these laws, and insisted on their abrogation. The free states maintained them, and demanded their confirmation through the enactment of the Wilmot proviso. The slave states and the free states were yet in equilibrium. The controversy continued here two years. The settlers of the new territories became impatient, and precipitated a solution of the question. They organized new free states in California and New Mexico. The Mormons also framed a government in Utah. Congress, after a bewildering excitement, determined the matter by another compromise. It admitted California a free state, dismembered New Mexico, transferring a large district free from slavery to Texas, whose laws carried slavery over it, and subjected the residue to a territorial government, as it also subjected Utah, and stipulated that the future states to be organized in those territories should be admitted either as free states or as slave states, as they should elect. I pass over the portions of this arrrangement which did not bear directly on the point in conflict. The federal government presented this compromise to the people as a comprehensive, final and perpetual adjustment of all then existing and all future questions having any relation to the subject of slavery within the territories or elsewhere. The country accepted it with that proverbial facility which free states practice, when time brings on a stern conflict which popular passions provoke, and at a distance defy. This halcyon peace, however, had not ceased to be celebrated, when new-born necessities of trade, travel and labor required an opening of the region in the old province of Louisiana north of 36° 30', which had been reserved in 1820, and dedicated to free labor and free states. The old question was revived in regard to that territory, and took the narrow name of the Kansas question, just as the stream which lake Superior dis-

charges, now contracting itself into rivers and precipitating itself down rapids and cataracts, and now spreading out its waters into broad seas, assumes a new name with every change of form, but continues, nevertheless, the same majestic and irresistible flood under every change, increasing in depth and in volume until it loses itself in the all-absorbing ocean.

No one had ever said or even thought that the law of freedom in this region could be repealed, impaired or evaded. Its constitutionality had indeed been questioned at the time of its enactment; but this, with all other objections, had been surrendered as part of the compromise. It was regarded as bearing the sanction of the public faith, as it certainly had those of time and acquiescence. But the slaveholding people of Missouri looked across the border into Kansas, and coveted the land. The slave states could not fail to sympathise with them. It seemed as if no organization of government could be effected in the territory. The senator from Illinois projected a scheme. Under his vigorous leading, congress created two territories, Nebraska and Kansas. The former (the more northern one) might, it was supposed, be settled without slavery, and become a free state, or several free states. The latter (the southern one) was accessible to the slave states, bordered on one of them, and was regarded as containing a region inviting to slaveholders. So it might be settled by them, and become one or more slave states. Thus indirectly a further compromise might be effected, if the Missouri prohibition of 1820 should be abrogated. Congress abrogated it, with the special and effective coöperation of the president, and thus the national government directly intervened in favor of slave labor. Loud remonstrances against the measure, on the ground of its violation of the national faith, were silenced by clamorous avowals of a discovery that congress had never had any right to intervene in the territories for or against slavery, but that the citizens of the United States residing within a territory, had, like the people of every state, exclusive authority and jurisdiction over slavery, as one of the domestic relations. The Kansas-Nebraska act only recognized and affirmed this right, as it was said. The theory was not indeed new, but a vagrant one, which had for some time gone about seeking among political parties the charity of adoption, under the name of squatter sovereignty. It was now brought to the font and baptized with the more attractive appellation of popular sovereignty. It was idle for

a time to say that, under the Missouri prohibition, freemen in the territory had all the rights which freemen could desire—perfect freedom to do everything but establish slavery. Popular sovereignty offered the indulgence of a taste of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of evil as well as of good—a more perfect freedom. Insomuch as the proposition seemed to come from a free state, the slave states could not resist its seductions, although sagacious men saw that they were delusive. Consequently a small and ineffectual stream of slave labor was at once forced into Kansas, engineered by a large number of politicians, advocates at once of slavery and of the federal administration, who proceeded with great haste to prepare the means so to carry the first election as to obtain the laws necessary for the protection of slavery. It is one thing, however, to expunge statutes from a national code, and quite another to subvert a national institution, even though it be only a monument of freedom located in the desert. Nebraska was resigned to free labor without a struggle, and Kansas became the theatre of the first actual national conflict between slaveholding and free-labor immigrants, met face to face, to organize, through the machinery of republican action, a civil community.

The parties differed as widely in their appointments, conduct and bearing, as in their principles. The free laborers came into the territory with money, horses, cattle, implements and engines, with energies concentrated by associations and strengthened by the recognition of some of the states. They marked out farms and sites for mills, towns and cities, and proceeded at once to build, to plow, and to sow. They proposed to debate, to discuss, to organize peacefully, and to vote, and to abide the canvass. The slave-labor party entered the territory irregularly, staked out possessions, marked them, and then, in most instances, withdrew to the states from which they had come, to sell their new acquisitions, or to return and resume them, as circumstances should render one course or the other expedient. They left armed men in the territory to keep watch and guard, and to summon external aid, either to vote or to fight, as should be found necessary. They were fortified by the favor of the administration, and assumed to act with its authority. Intolerant of debate, and defiant, they hurried on the elections which were to be so perverted that a usurpation should be established. They rang out their summons when the appointed time came, and armed bands of partisans, from

states near and remote, invaded and entered the territory, with banners, ammunition, provisions and forage, and encamped around the polls. They seized the ballot-boxes, replaced the judges of elections with partisans of their own, drove away their opponents, filled the boxes with as many votes as the exigencies demanded, and, leaving the results to be returned by reliable hands, they marched back again to their distant homes, to celebrate the conquest, and exult in the prospect of the establishment of slavery upon the soil so long consecrated to freedom. Thus, in a single day, they became parents of a state without affection for it, and childless again without bereavement. In this first hour of trial, the new system of popular sovereignty signally failed—failed because it is impossible to organize, by one single act, in one day, a community perfectly free, perfectly sovereign, and perfectly constituted, out of elements unassimilated, unarranged and uncomposed. Free labor rightfully won the day. Slave labor wrested the victory to itself by fraud and violence. Instead of a free republican government in the territory, such as popular sovereignty had promised, there was then and thenceforth a hateful usurpation. This usurpation proceeded without delay, and without compunction, to disfranchise the people. It transferred the slave code of Missouri to Kansas, without stopping in all cases to substitute the name of the new territory for that of the old state. It practically suspended popular elections for three years—the usurping legislature assigning that term for its own members, while it committed all subordinate trusts to agents appointed by itself. It barred the courts and the juries to its adversaries by test oaths, and made it a crime to think what one pleased, and to write and print what one thought. It borrowed all the enginery of tyranny but the torture from the practice of the Stuarts. The party of free labor appealed to the governor (Reeder) to correct the false election returns. He intervened, but ineffectually, and yet even for that intervention was denounced by the administration organs, and, after long and unacceptable explanations, he was removed from office by the president. The new governor (Shannon) sustained for a while the usurpation, but failed to effect the subjugation of the people, although he organized as a militia an armed partisan band of adventurers who had intruded themselves into the territory to force slavery upon the people. With the active coöperation of this band, the party of slave labor disarmed the free-state emigrants who had now learned the

necessity of being prepared for self-defense, on the borders of the territory and on the distant roads and rivers which led into it. They destroyed a bridge that free-labor men used in their way to the seat of government, sacked a hotel where they lodged, and broke up and cast into the river a press which was the organ of their cause.

The people of Kansas, thus deprived, not merely of self-government, but even of peace, tranquillity and security, fell back on the inalienable revolutionary right of voluntary reörganization. They determined, however, with admirable temper, judgment, and loyalty, to conduct their proceedings for this purpose in deference and subordination to the authority of the Federal Union, and according to the line of safe precedents.

After due elections, open to all the inhabitants of the territory, they organized provisionally a state government at Topeka; and by the hands of provisional senators, and a provisional representative, they submitted their constitution to congress, and prayed to be admitted as a free state into the Federal Union. The federal authorities lent no aid to this movement, but, on the contrary, the president and senate contemptuously rejected it, and denounced it as treason, and all its actors and abettors as disloyal to the Union. An army was dispatched into the territory, intended indeed to preserve peace, but at the same time to obey and sustain the usurpation. The provisional legislature, which had met to confer, and to adopt further means to urge the prayers of the people upon congress, were dispersed by the army, and the state officers provisionally elected, who had committed no criminal act, were arrested, indicted, and held in the federal camp as state prisoners. Nevertheless, the people of Kansas did not acquiesce. The usurpation remained a barren authority, defied, derided and despised.

A national election was now approaching. Excitement within and sympathies without the territory must be allayed. Governor Shannon was removed, and Mr. Geary was appointed his successor. He exacted submission to the statutes of the usurpation, but promised equality in their administration. He induced a repeal of some of those statutes which were most obviously unconstitutional, and declared an amnesty for political offenses. He persuaded the legislature of the usurpation to ordain a call for a convention at Lecompton, to form a constitution, if the measure should be approved by a popular vote at an election to be held for that purpose. To vote at such

an election was to recognize and tolerate the usurpation, as well as to submit to disfranchising laws, and to hazard a renewal of the frauds and violence by which the usurpation had been established. On no account would the legislature agree that the projected constitution should be submitted to the people, after it should have been perfected by the convention. The refusal of this just measure, so necessary to the public security in case of surprise and fraud, was a confession of the purpose on the part of the usurpation to carry a constitution into effect by surprise and fraud. The governor insisted on this provision, and demanded of the president of the United States the removal of a partial and tyrannical judge. He failed to gain either measure, and incurred the displeasure of the usurpation by seeking them. He fled from the territory. The free state party stood aloof from the polls, and a canvass showed that some twenty-three hundred, less than a third of the people of the territory, had sanctioned the call of a convention, while the presence of the army alone held the territory under a forced truce.

At this juncture, the new federal administration came in, under a president who had obtained success by the intervention at the polls of a third party—an ephemeral organization, built upon a foreign and frivolous issue, which had just strength enough and life enough to give to a pro-slavery party the aid required to produce that untoward result. The new president, under a show of moderation, masked a more effectual intervention than that of his predecessor, in favor of slave labor and a slave state. Before coming into office, he approached, or was approached, by the supreme court of the United States. On their docket was, through some chance or design, an action which an obscure negro man in Missouri had brought for his freedom against his reputed master. The court had arrived at the conclusion, on solemn argument, that insomuch as this unfortunate negro had, through some ignorance or chicane in special pleading, admitted what could not have been proved, that he had descended from some African who had once been held in bondage, that therefore he was not, in view of the constitution, a citizen of the United States, and therefore could not implead the reputed master in the federal courts; and on this ground the supreme court were prepared to dismiss the action, for want of jurisdiction over the suitor's person. This decision, certainly as repugnant to the Declaration of Independence and to the spirit of the constitution, as to

the instincts of humanity, nevertheless would be one which woul exhaust all the power of the tribunal, and exclude consideration o all other questions that had been raised upon the record. Th counsel who had appeared for the negro had volunteered fro motives of charity, and, ignorant of course of the disposition whic was to be made of the cause, had argued that his client had bee freed from slavery by operation of the Missouri prohibition of 182 The opposing counsel, paid by the defending slaveholder, ha insisted, in reply, that that famous statute was unconstitutiona The mock debate had been heard in the chamber of the court in th basement of the capitol, in the presence of the curious visitors at th seat of government, whom the dullness of a judicial investigatio could not disgust. The court did not hesitate to please the incomin president, by seizing this extraneous and idle forensic discussion, an converting it into an occasion for pronouncing an opinion that th Missouri prohibition was void, and that, by force of the constitution slavery existed, with all the elements of property in man over man in all the territories of the United States, paramount to any popula sovereignty within the territories, and even to the authority of con gress itself.

In this ill-omened act, the supreme court forgot its own dignity which had always before been maintained with just judicial jealousy They forgot that the province of a court is simply "*jus dicere*," an not at all "*jus dare*." They forgot, also, that one "foul sentenc does more harm than many foul examples; for the last do but co rupt the stream, while the former corrupteth the fountain." An they and the president alike forgot that judicial usurpation is mor odious and intolerable than any other among the manifold practice of tyranny.

The day of inauguration came—the first one among all the cel brations of that great national pageant that was to be desecrated b a coalition between the executive and judicial departments, to unde mine the national legislature and the liberties of the people. Th president, attended by the usual lengthened procession, arrived an took his seat on the portico. The supreme court attended him ther in robes which yet exacted public reverence. The people, unawar of the import of the whisperings carried on between the preside and the chief justice, and imbued with veneration for both, filled th avenues and gardens far away as the eye could reach. The pres

dent addressed them in words as bland as those which the worst of all the Roman emperors pronounced when he assumed the purple. He announced (vaguely, indeed, but with self-satisfaction) the forthcoming extra-judicial exposition of the constitution, and pledged his submission to it as authoritative and final. The chief justice and his associates remained silent. The senate, too, were there—constitutional witnesses of the transfer of administration. They too were silent, although the promised usurpation was to subvert the authority over more than half of the empire which congress had assumed cotemporaneously with the birth of the nation, and had exercised without interruption for near seventy years. It cost the president, under the circumstances, little exercise of magnanimity now to promise to the people of Kansas, on whose neck he had, with the aid of the supreme court, hung the millstone of slavery, a fair trial in their attempt to cast it off, and hurl it to the earth, when they should come to organize a state government. Alas! that even this cheap promise, uttered under such great solemnities, was only made to be broken!

The pageant ended. On the 5th of March, the judges, without even exchanging their silken robes for courtiers' gowns, paid their salutations to the president, in the executive palace. Doubtlessly the president received them as graciously as Charles the First did the judges who had at his instance subverted the statutes of English liberty. On the 6th of March, the supreme court dismissed the negro suitor, Dred Scott, to return to his bondage; and having thus disposed of that private action for an alleged private wrong, on the ground of want of jurisdiction in the case, they proceeded with amusing solemnity to pronounce the opinion, that if they had had such jurisdiction, still the unfortunate negro would have had to remain in bondage, unrelieved, because the Missouri prohibition violates rights of general property involved in slavery, paramount to the authority of congress. A few days later, copies of this opinion were multiplied by the senate's press, and scattered in the name of the senate broadcast over the land, and their publication has not yet been disowned by the senate. Simultaneously, Dred Scott, who had played the hand of *dummy* in this interesting political game, unwittingly, yet to the complete satisfaction of his adversary, was voluntarily emancipated; and thus received from his

master, as a reward, the freedom which the court had denied him a right.

The new president of the United States having organized th formidable judicial battery at the capitol, was now ready to beg his active demonstrations of intervention in the territory. He occurred, not a new want, but an old one revived—a governor f Kansas. Robert J. Walker, born and reared in Pennsylvania, a fr state, but long a citizen and resident of Mississippi, a slave stat eminent for talent and industry, devoted to the president and h party, plausible and persevering, untiring and efficient, seemed ju the man to conduct the fraudulent inchoate proceedings of the pr jected Lecompton convention to a conclusion, by dividing the friend of free labor in the territory, or by casting upon them the respons bility of defeating their own favorite policy by impracticability an contumacy. He wanted for this purpose only an army and ful command of the executive exchequer of promises of favor and o threats of punishment. Frederick P. Stanton, of Tennessee, honor able and capable, of persuasive address, but honest ambition, wa appointed his secretary. The new agents soon found they ha assumed a task that would tax all their energies and require all thei adroitness. On the one side, the slave-labor party were determine to circumvent the people, and secure, through the Lecompton con vention, a slave state. On the other, the people were watchful, an determined not to be circumvented, and in no case to submit Elections for delegates to that body were at hand. The legislatur had required a census and registry of voters to be made by autho rities designated by itself, and this duty had been only partially performed in fifteen of the thirty-four counties, and altogether omit ted in the other nineteen. The party of slave labor insisted o payment of taxes as a condition of suffrage. The free-labor party deemed the whole proceeding void, by reason of the usurpatio practised, and of the defective arrangements for the election. They discovered a design to surprise in the refusal of any guaranty tha the constitution, when framed, should be submitted to the people fo their acceptance or rejection, preparatory to an application under i for the admission of Kansas into the Union. The governor, drawing from the ample treasury of the executive at his command, made due exhibitions of the army, and threatened the people with an acceptance of the Lecompton constitution, however obnoxious to

them, if they should refuse to vote. With these menaces, he judiciously mingled promises of fabulous quantities of land for the endowment of roads and education. He dispensed with the test oaths and taxes, lamented the defects of census and registry, and promised the rejection of the constitution, by himself, by the president, and by congress, if a full, fair, and complete submission of the constitution should not be made by the convention; and he obtained and published pledges of such submission by the party conventions which nominated the candidates for delegates, and even by an imposing number of those candidates themselves. The people stood aloof, and refused to vote. The army protected the polls. The slave-labor party alone voted, and voted without legal restraint, and so achieved an easy formal success by casting some two thousand ballots.

Just in this conjuncture, however, the term of three years' service which the usurping legislature had fixed for its own members expired, and elections, authorized by itself, were to be held, for the choice, not only of new members, but of a delegate to congress. While the Lecompton convention was assembling, the free-labor party determined to attend these territorial elections, and contest, through them, for self-government within the territory. They put candidates in nomination, on the express ground of repudiation of the whole Lecompton proceeding. The Lecompton convention prudently adjourned to a day beyond the elections. The parties contended at the ballot-boxes, and the result was a complete and conclusive triumph of the free-labor party. For a moment, this victory, so important, was jeoparded by the fraudulent presentation of spurious and fabricated returns of elections in almost uninhabited districts, sufficient to transfer the triumph to the slave-labor party, and the free-state party was proceeding to vindicate it by force. The governor and secretary detected, proved, and exposed, this atrocious fraud. The Lecompton convention denounced them, and complaints against them poured in upon the president, from the slave-holding states. They were doomed from that time. The president was silent. The Lecompton convention proceeded, and framed a constitution which declares slavery perpetual and irreversible, and postpones any alteration of its own provisions until after 1864, by which time they hoped that slavery might have gained too deep a hold in the soil of Kansas to be in danger of being uprooted. All

this was easy; but now came the question whether the constituti should be submitted to the people. It was confessed that it w obnoxious to them, and, if submitted, would be rejected with indi nation and contempt. An official emissary from Washington supposed to have suggested the solution which was adopted. Th was a submission in form, but not in fact. The president of the co vention, without any laws to preserve the purity of the franchise b penalties for its violation, was authorized to designate his ow agents, altogether irrespectively of the territorial authorities, an with their aid to hold an election, in which there should be no vot allowed or received, if against the constitution itself. Each vote was permitted to cast a ballot "for the constitution with slavery, or "for the constitution with no slavery;" and it was further pr vided, that the constitution should stand entire, if a majority o votes should be cast for the constitution with slavery, while on th other hand, if the majority of votes cast should be "for the consti tution with no slavery," then the existing slavery should not b disturbed, but should remain, with its continuance, by the successio of its unhappy victims by descent forever. But even this miserabl shadow of a choice between forms of a slave state constitution wa made to depend on the taking of a test oath to support and main tain it in the form which should be preferred by the majority o those who should vote on complying with that humiliation. Th governor saw that by conniving at this pitiful and wicked juggle h should both shipwreck his fame and become responsible for civ war. He remonstrated, and appealed to his chief, the president o the United States, to condemn it. Denunciation followed him fro the Lecompton party within the territory, and denunciations no le violent from the slave states were his greeting at the national capita The president disappointed his most effective friend and wise counsellor.[1] This present congress had now assembled. The pres dent, as if fearful of delay, forestalled our attention with recom mendations to overlook the manifest objections to the transactio and to regard the anticipated result of this mock election, then n yet held, as equivalent to an acceptance of the constitution by th people of Kansas, alleging that the refusal of the people to vo either the ballot for the "constitution with slavery," or the false an deceitful ballot for the "constitution with no slavery," would just

[1] See Robert J. Walker's testimony, ante, page 31.

be regarded as drawing after it the consequences of actual acceptance and adoption of the constitution itself. His argument was apologetic, as it lamented that the constitution had not been fairly submitted; and jesuitical, as it urged that the people might, when once admitted as a state, change the constitution at their pleasure, in defiance of the provision which postpones any change seven years.

Copies of the message containing these arguments were transmitted to the territory, to confound and dishearten the free-state party, and obtain a surrender, at the election to be held on the 21st of December, on the questions submitted by the convention. The people, however, were neither misled nor intimidated. Alarmed by this act of connivance by the president of the United States with their oppressors, they began to prepare for the last abitrament of nations. The secretary, Mr. Stanton, now governor *ad interim*, issued his proclamation, calling the new territorial legislature to assemble to provide for preserving the public peace. An executive spy dispatched information of this proceeding to the president by telegraph, and instantly Mr. Stanton ceased to be secretary and governor *ad interim*, being removed by the president, by and with the advice and consent of the senate of the United States. Thus the service of Frederick P. Stanton came to an abrupt end, but in a manner most honorable to himself. His chief, Mr. Walker, was less wise and less fortunate. He resigned. Pætus Thrasea (we are informed by Tacitus) had been often present in the senate, when the fathers descended to unworthy acts, and did not rise in opposition; but on this occasion when Nero procured from them a decree to celebrate, as a festival, the day on which he had murdered his mother, Agrippina, Pætus left his seat, and walked out of the chamber—thus by his virtue provoking future vengeance, and yet doing no service to the cause of liberty. Possibly Robert J. Walker may find a less stern historian.

The new secretary, Mr. Denver, became governor of Kansas, the fifth incumbent of that office appointed within less than four years, the legal term of one. Happily, however, for the honor of the country, three of the recalls were made on the ground of the virtues of the parties disgraced. The pro-consuls of the Roman provinces were brought back to the capital to answer for their crimes.

The proceeding which the late secretary Stanton had so wisely instituted, nevertheless, went on; and it has become, as I trust, the principal means of rescuing from tyranny the people whom he gov-

erned so briefly and yet so well. The Lecompton constitution h directed, that on the 4th of January elections should be held to the state offices and the offices of members of the legislature a member of congress, to assume their trusts when the new st should be admitted into the Union. The legislature of the territo now enacted salutary laws for preserving the purity of elections all cases. It directed the Lecompton constitution to be submitted a fair vote on that day, the ballots being made to express a conse to the constitution, or a rejection of it, with or without slaver The free-labor party debated anxiously on the question, wheth besides voting against that constitution, they should, under prote vote also for officers to assume the trusts created by it, if congre should admit the state under it. After a majority had decided th no such votes should be cast, a minority hastily rejected the decisio and nominated candidates for those places, to be supported und protest. The success of the movement, made under the most serio disadvantages, is conclusive evidence of their strength. While t election held on the 21st of December, allowing all fraudulent vote showed some six thousand majority for the constitution with slaver over some five hundred votes for the constitution without slaver the election on the 4th of January showed an aggregate majority eleven thousand against the constitution itself in any form, with t choice, under protest, of a representative in congress, and of a lar majority of all the candidates nominated by the free-labor party f the various executive and legislative trusts under the Lecompto constitution.

The territorial legislature has abolished slavery by a law to ta effect in March, 1858, though the Lecompton constitution contai provisions anticipating, and designed to defeat, this great act justice and humanity. It has organized a militia, which stan ready for the defense of the rights of the people against any pow The president of the Lecompton constitution has fled the territor charged with an attempt to procure fraudulent returns to rever the already declared results of the last election, and he holds t public in suspense as to his success until after his arrival at t capital, and the decision of congress on the acceptance of the L compton constitution. In the meantime, the territorial legislatu has called a convention, subject to the popular approval, to be he in March next, and to form a constitution to be submitted to t

people, and, when adopted, to be the organic law of the new state of Kansas, subject to her admission into the Union. The president of the United States, having received the Lecompton constitution, has submitted it to congress, and insisting that the vote taken on the juggle of the Lecompton convention, held on the 21st of December, is legally conclusive of its acceptance by the people, and absolute against the fair, direct, and unimpeachable rejection of it by that people, made on the 4th of January last, he recommends and urges and implores the admission of Kansas as a state into the Federal Union, under that false, pretended, and spurious constitution. I refrain from any examination of this extraordinary message. My recital is less complete than I have hoped, if it does not overthrow all the president's arguments in favor of the acceptance of the Lecompton constitution as an act of the people of Kansas, however specious, and without descending to any details. In congress, those who seek the admission of Kansas under that constitution, strive to delay the admission of Minnesota, until their opponents shall compromise on that paramount question.

This is a concise account of the national intervention in the territories in favor of slave labor and slave states, since 1820. No wonder that the question before us excites apprehensions and alarms. There is at last a north side of this chamber, a north side of the chamber of representatives, a north side of the Union, as well as south sides of all these. Each of them is watchful, jealous, and resolute. If it be true, as has so often been asserted, that this Union cannot survive the decision by congress of a direct question involving the adoption of a free state which will establish the ascendency of free states under the constitution, and draw after it the restoration of the influence of freedom in the domestic and foreign conduct of the government, then the day of dissolution is at hand.

I have thus arrived at the third circumstance attending the Kansas question which I have thought worthy of consideration, namely, that the national intervention in the territories in favor of slave labor and slave states is opposed to the material, moral, and social developments of the republic. The proposition seems to involve a paradox, but it is easy to understand that the checks which the constitution applies, through wise precaution, to the relative increase of the representation of the free states in the house of representatives, and especially in the senate, coöperating with the differences

of temper and political activity between the two classes of states, may direct the government of the Federal Union in one course, while the tendencies of the nation itself, popularly regarded, are in a direction exactly opposite.

The ease and success which attended the earlier policy of intervention in favor of free labor and free states, and the resistance which the converse policy of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave states encounters, sufficiently establish the existence of the antagonism between the government and the nation which I have asserted. A vessel moves quietly and peacefully while it descends with the current. You mark its way by the foam on its track only when it is forced against the tide. I will not dwell on other proofs—such as the more rapid growth of the free states, the ruptures of ecclesiastical Federal Unions, and the demoralization and disorganization of political parties.

I have shown why it is that the Kansas question is attended by difficulties and dangers only by way of preparation for submitting my opinions in regard to the manner in which that question ought to be determined and settled. I think, with great deference to the judgments of others, that the expedient, peaceful and right way to determine it, is to reverse the existing policy of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave states. It would be wise to restore the Missouri prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska. There was peace in the territories and in the states until that great statute of freedom was subverted. It is true that there were frequent debates here on the subject of slavery, and that there were profound sympathies among the people, awakened by or responding to those debates. But what was congress instituted for but debate? What makes the American people to differ from all other nations, but this—that while among them power enforces silence, here all public questions are referred to debate, free debate in congress. Do you tell me that the supreme court of the United States has removed the foundations of that great statute? I reply that they have done no such thing; they could not do it. They have remanded the negro man, Dred Scott, to the custody of his master. With that decree we have nothing here, at least nothing now, to do. This is the extent of the judgment rendered, the extent of any judgment they could render. Already the pretended further decision is subverted in Kansas. So it will be in every free state and in every free territory of the United

States. The supreme court, also, can reverse its spurious judgment more easily than we could reconcile the people to its usurpation. The supreme court attempts to command the people of the United States to accept the principles that one man can own other men, and that they must guaranty the inviolability of that false and pernicious property. The people of the United States never can, and they never will, accept principles so unconstitutional and so abhorrent. Never, never. Let the court recede. Whether it recede or not, we shall reörganize the court, and thus reform its political sentiments and practices, and bring them into harmony with the constitution and with the laws of nature. In doing so, we shall not only reässume our own just authority, but we shall restore that high tribunal itself to the position it ought to maintain, since so many invaluable rights of citizens, and even of states themselves, depend upon its impartiality and its wisdom.

Do you tell me that the slave states will not acquiesce, but will agitate? Think first whether the free states will acquiesce in a decision that shall not only be unjust, but fraudulent. True, they will not menace the republic. They have an easy and simple remedy, namely, to take the government out of unjust and unfaithful hands, and commit it to those which will be just and faithful. They are ready to do this now. They want only a little more harmony of purpose, and a little more completeness of organization. These will result from only the least addition to the pressure of slavery upon them. You are lending all that is necessary, and even more, in this very act. But will the slave states agitate? Why? Because they have lost at last a battle that they could not win, unwisely provoked, fought with all the advantages of strategy and intervention, and on a field chosen by themselves. What would they gain? Can they compel Kansas to adopt slavery against her will? Would it be reasonable or just to do it, if they could? Was negro servitude ever forced by the sword on any people that inherited the blood which circulates in our veins, and the sentiments which make us a free people? If they will agitate on such a ground as this, then how, or when, by what concessions we can make, will they ever be satisfied? To what end would they agitate? It can now be only to divide the Union. Will they not need some fairer or more plausible excuse for a proposition so desperate? How would they improve their condition, by drawing down a certain ruin upon themselves?

Would they gain any new security for slavery? Would they not hazard securities that are invaluable? They who talk so idly, talk what they do not know themselves. No man when cool can promise what he shall do when he shall be inflamed; no man inflamed can speak for his actions when time and necessity shall bring reflection. Much less can any one speak for states in such emergencies.

But I shall not insist, now, on so radical a measure as the restoration of the Missouri prohibition. I know how difficult it is for power to relinquish even a pernicious and suicidal policy all at once. We may attain the same result, in this particular case of Kansas, without going back so far. Go back only to the ground assumed in 1854, the ground of popular sovereignty. Happily for the authors of that measure, the zealous and energetic resistance of abuses practised under it has so far been effective that popular sovereignty in Kansas may now be made a fact, and liberty there may be rescued from danger through its free exercise. Popular sovereignty is an epic of two parts. Part the first presents freedom in Kansas lost. Part the second, if you will so consent to write it, shall be freedom in Kansas regained. It is on this ground that I hail the eminent senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and his associates, the distinguished senator from Michigan [Mr. STUART], and the youthful, but most brave senator from California [Mr. BRODERICK]. The late Mr. Clay told us that Providence has many ways for saving nations. God forbid that I should consent to see freedom wounded, because my own lead or even my own agency in saving it should be rejected. I will cheerfully coöperate with these new defenders of this sacred cause in Kansas, and I will award them all due praise, when we shall have been successful, for their large share of merit in its deliverance.

Will you tell me that it is difficult to induce the senate and the house of representatives to take that short backward step? On the contrary, the hardest task that an executive dictator ever set, or parliamentary manager ever undertook, is to prevent this very step from being taken. Let the president take off his hand, and the bow, bent so long, and held to its tension by so hard a pressure, will relax, and straighten itself at once.

Consider now, if you please, the consequences of your refusal. If you attempt to coerce Kansas into the Union, under the Lecompton constitution, the people of that territory will resort to civil war.

You are pledged to put down that resolution by the sword. Will the people listen to your voice amid the thunders of your cannon? Let but one drop of the blood of a free citizen be shed there, by the federal army, and the countenance of every representative of a free state, in either house of congress, will blanch, and his tongue will refuse to utter the vote necessary to sustain the army in the butchery of his fellow citizens.

Practically, you have already one intestine and territorial war—a war against Brigham Young, in Utah. Can you carry on two, and confine the strife within the territories? Can you win both? A wise nation will never provoke more than one enemy at one time. I know that you argue that the free state men of Kansas are impracticable, factious, seditious. Answer me three questions: Are they not a majority, and so proclaimed by the people of Kansas? Is not this quarrel, for the right of governing themselves, conceded by the federal constitution? Is the tyranny of forcing a hateful government upon them, less intolerable than three cents impost on a pound of tea, or five cents stamp duty on a promissory note? You say that they can change this Lecompton constitution, when it shall once have been forced upon them. Let it be abandoned now. What guaranty can you give against your own intervention to prevent that future change? What security can you give for your own adherence to the construction of the constitution which you adopt, from expediency, to-day? What better is a constitution than a by-law of a corporation, if it may be forced on a state to-day, and rejected tomorrow, in derogation of its own express inhibition?

I perceive that, in the way of argument, I have passed already from the ground of expediency, on which I was standing, to that of right and justice. Among all our refinements of constitutional learning, one principle, one fundamental principle, has been faithfully preserved, namely: That the new states must come voluntarily into the Union; they must not be forced into it. "Unite or die," was the motto addressed to the states in the time of the revolution. Though Kansas should perish, she cannot be brought into the Union by force.

So long as the states shall come in by free consent, their admission will be an act of union, and this will be a confederacy. Whenever they shall be brought in by fraud or force, their admission will be an act of consolidation, and the nation, ceasing to be a confederacy,

will become in reality an empire. All our elementary instruction is wrong, or else this change of the constitution will subvert the liberties of the American people.

You argue the consent of Kansas from documentary proofs, from her forced and partial acquiescence, under your tyrannical rule, from elections fraudulently conducted, from her own contumacy, and from your own records, made up here against her. I answer the whole argument at once: Kansas protests here, and stands by your confession, in an attitude of rebellion at home, to resist the annexation which you contend she is soliciting at your hands.

If your proofs were a thousand times stronger, I would not hold the people of Kansas bound by them. They all are contradicted by stern facts. A people can be bound by no action conducted in their name, and pretending to their sanction, unless they enjoy perfect freedom and safety in giving that consent. You have held the people of Kansas in duress from the first hour of their attempted organization as a community. To crown this duress by an act, at once forcing slavery on them, which they hate, and them into a union with you, on terms which they abhor, would be but to illustrate anew, and on a grand scale, the maxim, "*Prosperum et felix scelus virtus vocatur.*"[1] It is an occasion for joy and triumph, when a community that has gathered itself together under circumstances of privation and exile, and proceeded through a season of territorial or provincial dependence on distant central authority, becomes a state, in the full enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and rises into the dignity of a member of this imperial Union. But, in the case of Kansas, her whole existence has been, and it yet is, a trial, a tempest, a chaos—and now you propose to make her nuptials a celebration of the funeral of her freedom. The people of Kansas are entitled to save that freedom, for they have won it back when it had been wrested from them by invasion and usurpation. You are great and strong. On this continent there is no power can resist you. On any other, there is hardly a power that would not reluctantly engage with you—but you can never, never conquer Kansas. Your power, like a throne which is built of pine boards, and covered with purple, is weakness, except it be defended by a people confiding in you, because satisfied that you are just, and grateful for the freedom that, under you, they enjoy.

[1] Wickedness, when successful and prosperous, is called virtue.

In view once more of this subject of slavery, I submit that our own dignity requires that we shall give over this champerty with slaveholders, which we practice in prescribing acquiescence in their rule as a condition of toleration of self-government in the territories. We are defeated in it. We may wisely give it up, and admit Kansas as a free state, since she will consent to be admitted only in that character.

If I could at all suppose it desirable or expedient to enlarge the field of slave labor and of slaveholding sway in this republic, I should, nevertheless, maintain that it is wise to relinquish the effort to sustain slavery in Kansas. The question, in regard to that territory, has risen from a private one about slavery as a domestic institution, to one of slavery as a national policy. At every step you have been failing. Will you go on still further, ever confident, and yet ever unsuccessful?

I believe to some extent in the isothermal theory. I think there are regions, beginning at the north pole, and stretching southward, where slavery will die out soon, if it be planted; and I know, too well, that in the tropics, and to some extent northward of them, slavery lives long and is hard to extirpate. But I cannot find a certain boundary. I am sure, however, that 36° 30′ is too far north. I think it is a movable boundary, and that every year it advances towards a more southern parallel.

But is there just now a real want of a new state for the employment of slave labor? I see and feel the need of room for a new state to be assigned to free labor, of room for such a new state almost every year. I think I see how it arises. Free white men abound in this country and in Europe, and even in Asia. Economically speaking, their labor is cheap—there is a surplus of it. Under improved conditions of society, life grows longer and men multiply faster. Wars, which sometimes waste them, grow less frequent and less destructive. Invention is continually producing machines and engines, artificial laborers, crowding them from one field of industry to another—ever more from the eastern regions of this continent to the west, ever more from the overcrowded eastern continent to the prairies and the wildernesses in our own. But I do not see any such overflowing of the African slave population in this country, even where it is unresisted. Free labor has been obstructed in Kansas. There are, nevertheless, fifty thousand or sixty thousand freemen

gathered there already—gathered there within four years. Slave-labor has been free to importation. There are only one hundred to two hundred slaves there. To settle and occupy a new slave state anywhere is, *pari passu*, to depopulate old slave states. Whence, then, are the supply of slaves to come, and how? Only by reviving the African slave trade. But this is forbidden. Visionaries dream that the prohibition can be repealed. The idea is insane. A republic of thirty millions of freemen, with a free white laboring population so dense as already to crowd on subsistence, to be brought to import negroes from Africa to supplant them as cultivators, and so to subject themselves to starvation. Though Africa is yet unorganized and unable to protect itself, still it has already exchanged, in a large degree, its wars to make slaves, and its commerce in slaves, for legitimate agriculture and slaves. All European states are interested in the civilization of that continent, and they will not consent that we shall arrest it. The Christian church cannot be forced back two centuries, and be made to sanction the African slave trade as a missionary enterprise.

Every nation has always some ruling idea, which, however, changes with the several stages of its development. A ruling idea of the colonies on this continent, two hundred years ago, was labor to subdue and reclaim nature. Then African slavery was seized and employed as an auxiliary, under a seeming necessity. That idea has ceased forever. It has given place to a new one. Aggrandizement of the nation, not indeed as it once was, to make a small state great, but to make a state already great the greatest of all states. It still demands labor, but it is no longer the ignorant labor of barbarians, but labor perfected by knowledge and skill, and combination with all the scientific principles of mechanism. It demands, not the labor of slaves, which needs to be watched and defended, but voluntary, enlightened labor, stimulated by interest, affection and ambition. It needs that every man shall own the land he tills; that every head shall be fit for the helmet, and every hand fit for the sword, and every mind ready and qualified for counsel. To attempt to aggrandize a country with slaves for its inhabitants, would be to try to make a large body of empire with feeble sinews and empty veins.

The expansion of territory to make slave states, will only fail to be a great crime because it is impracticable, and therefore will turn out to be a stupendous imbecility. A free republican government

like this, notwithstanding all its constitutional checks, cannot long resist and counteract the progress of society. Slavery, wherever and whenever, and in whatsoever form it exists, is exceptional, local and short-lived. Freedom is the common right, interest and ultimate destiny of all mankind. All other nations have already abolished, or are about abolishing, slavery. Does this fact mean nothing? All parties in this country that have tolerated the extension of slavery, except one, has perished for that error already. That last one, the democratic party, is hurrying on, irretrievably, toward the same fate. All administrations that have avowed this policy, have gone down dishonored for that cause, except the present one. A pit deeper and darker still is opening to receive this administration, because it sins more deeply than its predecessors. There is a meaning in all these facts, which it becomes us to study well. The nation has advanced another stage; it has reached the point where intervention by the government, for slavery and slave states, will no longer be tolerated. Free labor has at last apprehended its rights, its interests, its power, and its destiny, and is organizing itself to assume the government of the republic. It will henceforth meet you boldly and resolutely here; it will meet you everywhere, in the territories or out of them, wherever you may go to extend slavery. It has driven you back in California and in Kansas; it will invade you soon in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Missouri and Texas. It will meet you in Arizona, in Central America, and even in Cuba. The invasion will be not merely harmless, but beneficent, if you yield seasonably to its just and moderated demands. It proved so in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and the other slave states which have already yielded in that way to its advances. You may, indeed, get a start under or near the tropics, and seem safe for a time, but it will be only a short time. Even there you will found states only for free labor to maintain and occupy. The interests of the white races demands the ultimate emancipation of all men. Whether that consummation shall be allowed to take effect, with needful and wise precautions against sudden change and disaster, or be hurried on by violence, is all that remains for you to decide. For the failure of your system of slave labor throughout the republic, the responsibility will rest, not on the agitators you condemn, or on the political parties you arraign, or even altogether on yourselves, but it will be due to the inherent error of the system itself, and to the error which thrusts it

forward to oppose and resist the destiny, not more of the African than that of the white races. The white man needs this continent to labor upon. His head is clear, his arm is strong, and his necessities are fixed. He must and will have it. To secure it he will oblige the government of the United States to abandon intervention in favor of slave labor and slave states, and go backward forty years, and resume the original policy of intervention in favor of free labor and free states. The fall of the castle of San Juan d'Ulloa determined the fate of Mexico, although sore sieges and severe pitched battles intervened before the capture of the capital of the Aztecs. The defeats you have encountered in California and in Kansas, determine the fate of the principle for which you have been contending. It is for yourselves, not for us, to decide how long and through what further mortifications and disasters the contest shall be protracted, before freedom shall enjoy her already assured triumph. I would have it ended now, and would have the wounds of society bound up and healed. But this can be done only in one way. It cannot be done by offering further resistance, nor by any evasion or partial surrender, nor by forcing Kansas into the Union as a slave state, against her will, leaving her to cast off slavery afterwards, as she best may; nor by compelling Minnesota and Oregon to wait, and wear the humiliating costume of territories at the doors of congress, until the people of Kansas, or their true defenders here, shall be brought to dishonorable compromises. It can be done only by the simplest and direct admission of the three new states as free states, without qualification, condition, reservation or compromise, and by the abandonment of all further attempts to extend slavery under the federal constitution. You have unwisely pushed the controversy so far, that only these broad concessions will now be accepted by the interest of free labor and free states. For myself, I see this fact, perhaps the more distinctly now because I have so long foreseen it. I can therefore counsel nothing less than those concessions. I know the hazards I incur in taking this position. I know how men and parties, now earnest and zealous and bold, may yet fall away from me as the controversy shall wax warm, and alarms and dangers now unlooked for shall stare them in the face, as men and parties, equally earnest, bold and zealous, have done in like circumstances before. But it is the same position I took in the case of California eight years ago. It is the same I maintained on the great occasion of the organ-

ization of Kansas and Nebraska, four years ago. Time and added experience have vindicated it since, and I assume it again, to be maintained to the last, with confidence that it will be justified, ultimately, by the country and by the civilized world. You may refuse to yield it now and for a short period, but your refusal will only animate the friends of freedom with the courage and the resolution, and produce the union among them, which alone are necessary on their part to attain the position itself simultaneously with the impending overthrow of the existing federal administration and the constitution of a new and more independent congress.

This expansion of the empire of free white men is to be conducted through the process of admitting new states, and not otherwise. The white man, whether you consent or not, will make the states to be admitted, and he will make them all free states. We must admit them, and admit them all free; otherwise they will become independent and foreign states, constituting a new empire to contend with us for the continent. To admit them is a simple, easy and natural policy. It is not new to us or to our times. It began with the voluntary union of the first thirteen. It has continued to go on, overriding all resistance ever since. It will go on until the ends of the continent are the borders of our Union. Thus we become colaborers with our fathers, and even with our posterity throughout many ages. After times, contemplating the whole vast structure, completed and perfected, will forget the dates, and the eras, and the individualities of the builders in their successive generations. It will be one great republic, founded by one body of benefactors. I wonder that the president of the United States undervalues the Kansas question, when it is a part of a transaction so immense and sublime. Far from sympathizing with him in his desire to deprecate it and to be rid of it, I felicitate myself on my humble relation to it, for I know that heaven cannot grant, nor man desire, a more favorable occasion to acquire fame, than he enjoys who is engaged in laying the foundations of a great empire; and I know, also, that while mankind have often deified their benefactors, no nation has ever yet bestowed honors on the memories of the founders of slavery.

I have always believed that this glorious federal constitution of ours is adapted to the inevitable expansion of the empire which I have so feebly presented. It has been perverted often by misconstruction, and it has yet to be perverted many times, and widely,

hereafter; but it has inherent strength and vigor that will cast of all the webs which the everchanging interests of classes may weav around it. If it fail us now, it will, however, not be our fault, bu because an inevitable crisis, like that of youth or of manhood, is t be encountered by a constitution proved in that case to be inadequat to the trial. I am sure that no patriot, who views the subject as do, could wish to evade or delay the trial. By delay we could onl extend slavery, at the most, throughout the Atlantic region of th continent. The Pacific slope is free, and it always must and will b free. The mountain barriers that separate us from that portion o our empire, are quite enough to alienate us too widely, possibly t separate us too soon. Let us only become all slaveholding states o this side of those barriers, while only free states are organized and per petuated on the other side, and then indeed there will come a divisio of the great American family into two nations, equally ambitious fo complete control over the continent, and a conflict between them, ove which the world will mourn, as the greatest and last to be retrieve of all the calamities that have ever befallen the human race.

APRIL 30, 1858.[1]

THIS debate has manifestly lost some of its interest, although i rapidly approaches a yet undetermined conclusion. The length o time it has occupied may account in a degree for the decline o excitement. Repetition of the same topics, and even of the sam arguments, not indeed too often for duly enlightening the minds o the people of the United States, yet too frequent for patient ende rance here, is a further cause. I think, however, that something i due also to the change of form which the subject has at last assume We began with high-sounding themes, nothing less than popula sovereignty, and we rose speedily and justly into the region of th rights of human nature. The question wore this dignity when w gave it to the committee of conference. It comes back from th conference chamber, reduced into a mere artifice—if it were respect ful, I should say a trick—of legislative legerdemain. It is assume that one or both of two irreconcilable factions are to be deceived all that seems to be left for us to discuss, or the public to consider

[1] Closing speech in the Senate on the Lecompton constitution and the English Conference Bi See ante page 50.

is, who shall be the dupe? This is that kind of debate for which I have the least taste, and, as I think, the least talent.

The bill of the conference committee on Kansas was gotten up to favor a purpose of self-deception; gotten up with care, so that it could not be explained satisfactorily by the one faction to the other, or even to itself.

To use equivocation in legislation is an act of immorality deserving of severe censure. What reverence, what respect, what submission, what obedience, can you expect from the citizen, if legislatures resort to such reprehensible practices in making the laws? There are very bad consequences of this immoral transaction lying in the future, if they be not prevented by the vigilance and resolution of the people. The measure in that case will draw after it, not merely the admission of one or more slave states into this Union, to increase already our too serious embarrassments resulting from antagonisms between the states, but all the grave consequences which must result from the establishment of a belt of slave states in the centre of the continent, from our northern to our southern border, directly across our great highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. You have only by this, or by any other means, direct or indirect, to fix slavery there, and you will have raised a wall of separation between the eastern and the western, the Atlantic and the Pacific portions of the empire, more insurmountable than the ridges of the Rocky mountains, or the snow-clad summits of the further range that projects its shadow far abroad upon the waves of the Pacific.

It amuses me much when I hear patriotic and sagacious men predicting the removal of this capital from the falls of the Potomac to the junction of the Alleghany and Monongahela, or sometimes, with a longer forecast, to Cincinnati, the queen city of Ohio, or further on to St. Louis, and so settling and fixing the centre of power in the valley of the Mississippi. If you will only confine this institution of slavery within its present ample boundaries, giving it no further room nor verge, the capital of this country may remain where it is, but the centre of the Union will fall nearer the valley of Mexico than the valley of the Mississippi. Then that federal authority will grasp the equator on the one side, and the northern pole on the other. But no such promise, no such hope, awaits the republic, if you separate the free Atlantic states from the free states of the Pacific coast.

While this bill ignores the actual dispute out of which it originated, it suppresses with double care the great controlling political fact which lies everywhere just beneath the surface of the whole debate. If Kansas shall come into the Union under the Lecompton constitution, she will come in as a slave state. If she come under any other constitution, it is hoped by those who advocate freedom that she will come as a free state. This bill gives to Kansas the choice of being a slave state, and only that choice. You have already induced the supreme court of the United States so to pervert your constitution, that the president, on their authority, declares that Kansas, while she is a territory, is as much a slave state as South Carolina. The change you offer her is, that if she will accept the Lecompton constitution, she shall be recognized in name and form as a slave state, in lieu of remaining a slave state in the form and stature of a territory. Your bill does indeed say that in the future—God knows how far in the future it may be—if the people of Kansas, if they shall now reject the Lecompton constitution, may make a constitution for themselves, and send it here for your consideration; but it shall not be done until they shall have a largely-augmented population. This postponement is a mockery! When the people of Kansas shall come here with a free constitution, years hence, they will do only what they did two years ago. You refused them then. When they come here with a constitution making them a free state, and submit it to you, they will have a constitution that contains just what they had in the Missouri prohibition of slavery, thirty-eight years ago; and you struck that prohibition from the statute book. When they come, years hence, be they few or many, and asked to be admitted a free state, they will be just exactly in the same attitude they maintain now, and demanding then only what they demand now, and what you refuse them.

You are only asking us to wager against chance, backed by device and fraud. Here is a piece of silver, of the coin of the United States. On this side is the eagle; on the other, the figure emblematical of liberty. You cover it with your hand, and say to Kansas, wager whether the "eagle" or "liberty" is uppermost. Say "eagle," and you have "slavery;" say "liberty," and still "slavery" wins the wager. This bill is no new piece of music. It is Lecompton over again, only with a new variation; but the abhorrent air of fraud pervades the whole arrangement of the composition.

I beg now to say most distinctly that this bill must in both houses owe its passage to the votes of representatives of the free states of the north and west. I beg, therefore, to ask the honorable senator from Pennsylvania, himself a representative of the first state in this Union that after the revolution moved for universal freedom, what the people of Kansas have done, that they shall not be indulged at least in an equal choice between liberty and slavery? I ask my venerable and esteemed friend from Rhode Island, the land of Roger Williams, how he supposes that he can reconcile that proud and patriotic free state, that one which was earliest and most completely free of all the states in this Union, to this bill, which gives state power and prestige and a dowry of lands to Kansas if she will choose slavery, and gives her provincial degradation and debasement, with poverty, if she elects freedom? I ask my excellent friend from Iowa, he who represents a state carved out of that rich and beautiful domain which, having been acquired by purchase from France, was dedicated to freedom by the Missouri compromise—the same great act which originally guarantied freedom to Kansas, but which guaranty was broken to Kansas, though preserved to Iowa—I ask him what answer he will give to that gallant people, for having planted on their border a state which was denied the liberty to choose on equal terms between freedom and slavery? I will not ask the honorable senator from California, whose state was saved to freedom by efforts other than his own, but who knows that, by that very salvation, there was saved to California resources of wealth and strength, and power, which secure her control over the Pacific coast of this continent, and render her self-sustaining and almost defiant—I will not ask him for an explanation. I said, when California was admitted, that the slave states need not fear her; that though settled by a population chiefly from the free states, California, owing to a disastrous conjunction of parties at the time, would prove for years to come the strongest slave state in the Union. I will not ask the honorable senator from Ohio, for I have already interpreted, according to my humble ability, the views by which he reconciles this measure to the judgment of his great constituency. I would, indeed, ask the honorable senators from Indiana, but they may have that question to settle at home speedily, without being interrogated here.

My honorable friend from Vermont reminds me that I have forgotten New Jersey. I will speak for New Jersey myself. The

blood of men who hazarded life, fame, and fortune, for freedom, in the "Jerseys," courses through my own veins. I know the blue hills of the Jerseys well. They are mingled with all the fond recollections of my childhood. I will answer, that the votes which are given here for this Lecompton bill are the last votes which in ten years will be given for slavery by representatives of New Jersey.

I have shown that this bill gives to the people of Kansas only the show of a choice between freedom and slavery. I have next to show that it provides for overriding, counteracting, and defeating this very shadow of a choice, if it shall be in favor of freedom. The bill provides, not that the people of Kansas or their legislature or their authorities shall appoint the commissions under whom the contemplated election shall be held and its results ascertained, but a board, to consist of five persons; and, while it allows two to be named by the people of Kansas, it asks three for the president of the United States. Now there have been five agents appointed already by the president of the United States and his predecessor, to hold elections and return results in the territory of Kansas, and every one of them has been repudiated, dishonored, and disgraced, for having struggled to prevent fraud, and to ascertain and certify the truth about these elections. The ghosts on the banks of the Styx constitute a cloud scarcely more dense than the spirits of the departed governors of Kansas, wandering in exile and sorrow for having certified the truth against falsehood in regard to the elections between freedom and slavery in Kansas.

I am accustomed to measure my words, when I speak of other men, even of public men. Knowing how liable I am to err myself, I think I have so much of charity as induces a favorable judgment of an adversary, to the full measure that I ask and expect it for myself. But though it is with pain and shame and mortification, yet I do confess that I cannot trust the president of the United States. It is the most humiliating confession I have ever made in the presence of my countrymen and before the world; for whenever I have looked over the long roll of kings, princes, doges, and emperors, and have seen how their careers, so often began in fraud, culminated in assassination, and ended in violence, I have said that a complete demonstration of the success of the American constitution is found in the fact that, with all its defects, and amid the erratic and sometimes tumultuous movements of the people, the catalogue

of names of those who have filled the presidency exhibits a splendor of virtue far outshining that of any dynasty that has ever ruled any nation on the face of the whole earth. If the president of the United States had ever allowed, not to say if he had enforced, fairness in the elections of Kansas, she would not be a suppliant, trembling with dismay and apprehension in the senate of the United States to-day. I know that, in speaking thus plainly, I shall wound the sensibilities of some public-spirited and patriotic men. They will cry shame upon me, when I disparage the fame of the president of the United States. But I am used to that. The world is used to that. I remember that there were patriots in Virginia who cried shame on Patrick Henry, when he denounced George III. There were not wanting patriots in the senate of Rome, who heard with pain Cato denounce the first Cæsar. Those who have dragged liberty down from her shrine, and trampled her into the dust, have not often been those who in senates accused emperors, kings, or presidents.

Upon what ground is this bill, thus shown to be so gravely objectionable, recommended to us? First, it is commended as a compromise. The honorable chairman tells us, that where there is a difference between two parties or interests, there can never be a settlement unless there is a compromise; that the house of representatives have given up something, and that the senate have given up something to the house, although everybody except myself has failed in finding out what there is either given or gotten. Still we are to accept the bill as a compromise. If it is a compromise urged upon me, it must be one that gives me something of freedom in exchange for much of slavery. What do I get of freedom for Kansas? The privilege for that people to make a constitution when they shall have a population of one hundred thousand souls, and coming here then and presenting that constitution to congress for its approval. Very well. Is Kansas to be a free state then? No. Then Kansas shall be admitted either free or slave, just exactly as the people shall desire. Well, that is just what the Kansas-Nebraska act gave us in 1854. We have had that great privilege ever since. We could always make a constitution, and come here and obtain admission, either free or slave, as we pleased, according to the text of your statute book. But we have come here and demanded freedom, and have been contumaciously spurned from

your presence. We refuse to be admitted a slave state, and we are remanded home to try it over again, and reconcile ourselves to slavery, under the penalty of coming here no more until we number one hundred thousand souls. If Kansas shall do this, and be docile and quiet, you think now that you will admit her when she come as a free state, half a dozen or a dozen years hence. But you hope, nevertheless, that in the meantime she will be demoralized, and so will come at last a slave state. I tell you, moreover, that when she shall come again as a free state, as she will, you will then be unable to satisfy yourselves upon her full compliance with all the forms required to be observed by a state in reaching that happy condition. Let us not deceive ourselves. There is no freedom for Kansas under this bill.

But a compromise is made between two contending parties, by their representatives. Who are the parties here? The real parties in this dispute are, on the one side, the free state party of Kansas and the republican party of the Union; and on the other hand, the slave state party of Kansas and the democracy of the Union. This compromise is one made between the two factions of the democratic party, excluding every free state man of Kansas and every representative of the republican party in congress. There is not one in our whole number who consents to this bargain. It is, therefore, just no compromise at all; it is only the pretense of compromise. I was born suspicious of legislative compromises. That temper has grown on me more and more every day of my life. I have studied their dangers, and seen the evils that resulted from them; and I made up my mind, when I came here, that I would harden my face as a flint against any compromise whatever between slavery and freedom. This so-called compromise, however, inspires me with hope unknown before. I look on it with more complacency than I have ever looked on any other; for it is such a weak and pitiful imitation of the great compromises which have been hallowed in the respect and affection of the people of the United States for generations, that it will bring the whole system of compromises itself, henceforth and forever, into ridicule and unmitigated contempt.

The honorable senator from Virginia and the honorable senator from Missouri commend the bill to us as a measure of peace; at least, the honorable senator from Virginia promises that it will bring a truce for four or five years. There is no peace in this world for

compromisers; there is no peace for those who practice evasion; there is no peace in a republican land for any statesmen but those who act directly, and boldly abide the popular judgment whenever it may be fairly and clearly and fully ascertained, without attempting to falsify the issue submitted, or to corrupt the tribunal.

Beneath the thin gauze that is spread over this signal of truce, I see distinctly mingled stains of fraud and blood, black spots and red, the true unerring marks of a piratical flag. If you mean by troubles to be composed, apprehensions of civil commotion, of violence, of turbulence, of sedition, of faction and civil war, I tell you frankly that you need be at no pains to make peace to prevent those dire evils. This cause of equal and impartial freedom in the states has at last become strong enough to work its way through lawful and constitutional forms to its destined and final triumph. But if you mean, on the other hand, that agitation which has already given to that great cause the strength and power it now exhibits, and if you expect that that agitation will be arrested or suppressed by this or by any other legislative device of this nature, then let me tell you that you reckon altogether wildly.

I smile when I hear senators talk about the people getting tired of Kansas and this eternal agitation of slavery. They consult the commercial presses of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston, and those oracles respond with assurances that the people are exhausted, and willing and impatient to have the Kansas question ended in any way, with popular sovereignty or without, with fairness or without, with or without slavery. They see only the eddy; they do not stretch their vision far enough to see the tide. They make the same mistake which the felon did a few months ago, when in the darkness of the winter's night, on the bank of the Genesee, he slew his brother, and precipitated the mangled body down into the river, just below the first fall, and just above the other, thence to float down the last cataract, and be buried forever in the lake below. But when the morning came, the corpse of the victim lay floating on the shallow water by the river side. He had mistaken the eddy near the shore for the full and ever-swelling flood which man can by no art or power compress or restrain. Senators, you shall have peace in Kansas, you will have peace in Kansas. It will come, not by reason of what you do to court or compel it, but in spite of yourselves;

but it will come in the train of the triumph of peace-giving policy and principles.

How do you expect to get peace by this bill? By this bill, if it works as you expect, you will get a slave state one way or another. You will get a slave state in one case by a popular election, under the operation of bribes and menaces. Will the people of Kansas remain corrupted after they have accepted your bribe and escaped your terrors? That is not in keeping with the character of the American people. You will get it by fraud—by a certificate from the president that popular sovereignty has gone in favor of Lecompton, when, in fact, it has gone the other way. Will that make peace? I should like to be near by, and see the new slave state attempted to be organized under the Lecompton constitution.

I remember that legislators as wise as we—the world thought them much wiser—who had seats in St. Stephen's chapel, and had a president whom they honored as much as we do ours, though they called him a king, insisted that the people of New York should live under what to them was a slave constitution, while they had made up their minds to have a free one, established by themselves. The Provincial British government went on board the Halifax packet, and thence sent forth its remonstrances and denunciations, under cover of his majesty's guns. They were, however, merely *brutum fulmen*. After a short time, the British government and the British ship disappeared together below the Neversink, to return no more forever. The British parliament undertook, also, to rule Virginia under a slave constitution as it was regarded by her. But, as the strife rose higher, the provincial authority, with the prestige and power of the British empire to back it, took refuge on board the schooner Fowey, and descended to Hampton Roads. There it committed a few pitiful invasions upon the property of patriotic planters and citizens of that great state, and then disappeared forever.

Your Lecompton government of Kansas will be afloat on the Missouri river when it begins. The Missouri will not be wide enough for its safety. It must go down, and pass into the broader channel of the Mississippi; and when you next look for it, you will find it stranded on the beach of the gulf of Mexico. There is to be no Lecompton state, no slave state, in Kansas. Nevertheless, you enact by this law that there shall be a slave state in Kansas, and there shall be no other. Well, if you shall pass the bill to-day, as you

say you will, it will reach Kansas in about ten days. In about ten days more, the new state of Kansas will be organized under the new Leavenworth free-state constitution, and about the seventh day of June, when you are impatient to go home, Kansas will be beleaguering you here for admission as a free state. She will be telling you that she knows nothing about your projected slave state within her borders. She has not seen it; it is not there at all. You of course will spurn her from your path, and will go home. The people of Kansas will then appeal to the popular elections throughout the United States, which are to send to this capitol twenty new senators and a whole house of representatives about the first Tuesday in November next. Now, I ask the honorable supporters of this bill here, belonging to the free states, about how many democratic senators and representatives they expect will be returned by the people upon the passage of this bill? I ask for information. The honorable senator from California [Mr. BRODERICK] has spoken for the only free state that I thought was hopelessly lost to us for a quarter of a century. For all the rest, I think that, if it were not presumptuous, I might speak myself. But I leave the representatives of those states to speak.

The people of Kansas will come here on the first Monday in December next, when you assemble here, and they will ask you to admit them as a free state. Have you any law that will prevent their coming in that character, and for that purpose? The constitution of the United States declares that the people may petition congress, and they may petition for what they please. The people of Kansas may petition to be admitted as a free state under the Leavenworth constitution. Have you any constitutional prohibition to prevent me from voting in favor of their prayer? I shall vote for their admission as a free state, in spite of a thousand such laws as this. I tell you, moreover, that you, yourselves, or a large number of you, will vote for it also, to prevent the question going over to the next congress, then already elected, because that congress would vote for it if you do not anticipate them, to save yourselves the credit of stanching the wounds of bleeding Kansas, and establishing forever the cause of freedom. All this will happen unless you send armies to suppress such proceedings in Kansas. Well, I should like to see the bill introduced into congress now, to levy or supply an army to subjugate freemen and extirpate freedom in Kansas.

That game is ended. You cannot even pass a bill to maintain, rather to regain, your authority in Utah against polygamists, wit out infinite trouble.

You will fail in obtaining a support of this policy, in the conte before you, because, for the first time, you will go before the peop of the United States stripped naked of every pretense of equality impartiality between freedom and slavery, much more of that virt which is the only mantle that can now cover and conceal politic faults in this country—devotion to freedom and free labor. Th honorable senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the honorable sen tor from Michigan [Mr. STUART], and the honorable senator fro California [Mr. BRODERICK], with their associates in the house, an the honorable senator from Kentucky [Mr. CRITTENDEN], and th honorable senator from Tennessee [Mr. BELL], have stripped yo bare of all pretenses to fairness in the exercise of maintaining you own avowed policy of popular sovereignty. You will go before th people no longer in the character of a party that balances equall between freedom and slavery, but in the detested character of a part intervening for slavery against freedom. You will meet in the ele tions, not as heretofore, two or three factions, giving you a triump by their divisions, which you could not win by your own number but one party only, and that party combined, resolute and animate by a sincere, deep and common devotion to the principles it mai tains. On the other hand, you yourselves, no longer united, wi reach the polls in jealous divisions and under different stan ards—one faction wanting slavery absolutely and without regard t partisan success or popular consent, the other hesitating and haltin on the position of no slavery anywhere, unless the people choose i

Let me try for a moment to lift this debate up from these temp rary, ephemeral and collateral incidents, to that height of argume where it belongs. The sixteenth century dawned on the deca throughout Europe and the world of a slave civilization, derive from early antiquity, and left as a legacy by the Latin or souther states of the continent of Europe, on the fall of the Roman empir But it dawned also upon the rise of a new and better civilization— the civilization of freedom—the civilization since developed of th German and Sclavonic races; the civilization of Germany and o England, of Scotland, and Ireland, and Switzerland, in short, the no well-defined civilization of western Europe.

The principle of the old Latin civilization, which was passing away, was that labor must be involuntary, must be secured by fraud and force, and must be converted into property, and bought and sold as merchandise. The new civilization was based on the principle of the freedom of labor, that it must be voluntary, and that it should be not only a political power, but that it should even become the ascendant and dominating political power throughout the world. While Portugal and Spain proved themselves competent to open and lead the great career of discovery, and the one revealed interior and southern Africa, and the other America, to the eyes of an astonished world, these two nations were, less than any others, qualified to inaugurate civilization on either continent. The Portuguese, with a cupidity and cruelty unparalleled, doomed Africa to remain perpetually in the barbarism with which she had been cursed from her earliest history, by establishing there the African slave trade, in which ten men were sold in exchange for one horse; and the Spaniards compelled America to receive, and for a while to remain incumbered with the civilization of labor by African slaves, captured and sold to them by the Portuguese. Our constitution and our Union came into being seventy years ago, in a conjuncture when it was necessary to decide between those two systems of civilization found existing together within our borders. The states which have founded or adopted the new civilization are before you. Contemplate them, and say whether the world has ever seen communities so perfect and so prosperous. You see, also, the states which were founded on or have retained the old declining civilization of the Roman empire.

All our new states have to choose between the two systems. We have a voice, at least an influence, in determining their decision. You are bent on forcing that old and *effete* civilization upon new regions where political and social evil has until now been unknown.

This question in regard to Kansas ought to have been settled fifty-five years ago, in 1803, when Kansas was added to the national territory by the treaty with France, as part of the Louisiana purchase. It was omitted then. It recurred in 1820, and then it was well and wisely settled, by dedicating Kansas forever to impartial freedom. In 1854 you repealed that law, but the law you thus repealed was a statute of the Almighty, written upon the rivers and prairies and rocks of Kansas, as well as in the very constitution of American society. All you have done since consists of fruitless efforts to carry

the ill-judged repeal of a benignant policy int
the laws of nature. In what you have don
had what the whole world received as an exc
indeed of the slave states, but it was not on t
suggestion came to them from senators from
was not in human nature that they should res

So, in 1856, when Kansas came here as a free
constitution, and you rejected her, you still
excuse, for those same representatives of the
that the people of the free states would acquie
after having failed in these efforts to estab
persisting in and renewing them without that
senators, one of them the leader in the repeal
promise, the other hardly less effective in
remonstrate with you against further prosecu
as impossible. Still another, from Michigan,
the late distinguished senator from Michigan,
department of state [General CASS]. I do n
strates by speech, but I do say that the retir
man from this chamber, so suited to his talen
and his fame, into a closet in an executive dep
ment, under an appointment by the president
is a louder remonstrance than any words he
stituents had allowed him to retain his place a
tives of the states.

Even that is not all. At last a new voice
region, from the south, from the slave state
your further persistence in this mad enterp
gathering in the south; the men of conservat
heretofore moderated in favor of slavery aga
be obliged, in consistency with their just and
ter and their political patriotism, to moderate
freedom, when the people are demanding f
unanimously against slavery.

This whole controversy is at last reduced
quarrel on your part for revenge against these
of listening to their counsels, you will suppr
and punish their authors as mutineers. Well
consequence to me. To myself, personally, t

tinguished senators, and their associates in the house of representatives, is nothing, except so far as the positions which they shall maintain shall bear on the result of the present contest to establish a new and better policy in the country. I know not, indeed, whether I shall be found hereafter laboring with them in efforts to promote the public welfare, or whether they will return to your councils, and labor in your own ranks as heretofore. Nevertheless, I am sure of this—that you will not succeed in discrediting and proscribing them; for either you provide for yourselves a defeat, which the signs of the times indicate, or, in lieu of that, you will go down to 1860 under the influence of sentiments and feelings very different from that of 1858. A party in power in the first year of an administration, is apt to be bold and violent. A party going out of power at the close of an administration generally is timid and hesitating. You will search the summits in New Hampshire, the plains in Mexico, and the halls of St. James in London, to find a presidential candidate in 1860, who was against the conference-Lecompton-Kansas bill in 1858; and then, if these honorable gentlemen with whom I have labored for a short time so pleasantly, shall be found yet remaining within your political communion, I think I can promise them that you will come to a much better understanding with them than you have now.[1]

While I am yet speaking, I learn that this bill, of so much evil omen, has passed the house of representatives. I confess to you that it produces in my mind, if some disappointment, no discouragement. I confess that I am prepared for this conclusion; and that now, when it has come (for what remains to be done in this chamber is a matter of course), it is to me utterly indifferent. I have known all the while that this was to be either our last defeat or our first victory. Either result was sure to be quite welcome. For Kansas, for freedom in Kansas, I have not so much concern as I have about the place where I shall sleep to-night, although my house is hard by the place where I stand. Kansas is the Cinderella of the American family. She is insulted, she is buffeted, she is smitten and disgraced, she is turned out of the dwelling, and the door is locked against her. There is always, however, a fairy that takes care of the younger daughter, if she be the most virtuous, the most truthful, the meekest, and the most enduring inmate of the domestic circle. Kansas

[1] These predictions were singularly verified at the Charleston and Baltimore conventions of 1860. See Memoir *ante* page 74.

will live and survive your persecution. protect and sustain you. The time will come sisters now so arrogant, Louisiana, Virgin will repent themselves of all the injustice Her trials have not been imposed on her for made to take the hard and hazardous positi the states to vindicate practically by labor, tion, through suffering and blood, the princi for states and for the republic than slaver trial nobly to the end, as she has borne it h been the first, so she will be the last to conte territory that shall come into the Union h sufferings and atonement of Kansas, will co state. This unnecessary strife, so unwisel draws to its end. The effort to make slave is against reason and against nature. The from the roots and seeds scattered by the pa more naturally than new free states spring u projected and the social seed scattered by th stars do not form themselves out of the ne space, and come out to adorn and illuminat us more necessarily or more harmoniousl shape themselves out of the ever-developing civilization, and rise to take their places in stellation. Reason and hope rejoice in this process. Let, then, nature, reason and h appointed way. Resist them no longer!

NOTE.—While these pages are going through the press (J admission of Kansas has ended. On the 30th day of January admission, and Kansas became a free state. The bill was n on the twenty-first, and passed on the same day: ayes 36, nay

THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY.[1]

In coming forward among the political astrologers, it shall be an error of judgment, and not of disposition, if my interpretation of the feverish dreams which are disturbing the country shall tend to foment, rather than to allay, the national excitement. I shall say nothing unnecessarily of persons, because, in our system, the public welfare and happiness depend chiefly on institutions, and very little on men. I shall allude but briefly to incidental topics, because they are ephemeral, and because, even in the midst of appeals to passion and prejudice, it is always safe to submit solid truth to the deliberate consideration of an honest and enlightened people.

It will be an everflowing source of shame, as well as of sorrow, if we, thirty millions—Europeans by extraction, Americans by birth or discipline, and Christians in faith, and meaning to be such in practice—cannot so combine prudence with humanity, in our conduct concerning the one disturbing subject of slavery, as not only to preserve our unequaled institutions of freedom, but also to enjoy their benefits with contentment and harmony.

Wherever a guiltless slave exists, be he Caucasian, American, Malay or African, he is the subject of two distinct and opposite ideas—one that he is wrongly, the other that he is rightly a slave. The balance of numbers on either side, however great, never completely extinguishes this difference of opinion, for there are always some defenders of slavery outside, even if there are none inside of a free state, while also there are always outside, if there are not inside of every slave state, many who assert with Milton, that "no man who knows aught can be so stupid as to deny that all men naturally were born free, being the image and resemblance of God himself, and were by privilege above all the creatures, born to command and not to obey." It often, perhaps generally, happens, however,

[1] Speech in the United States Senate, February 29, 1860. The bill before the Senate being "the admission of Kansas," Mr. Seward commenced by saying: "The admission of Kansas into the Union, without further delay, seems to me equally necessary, just and wise. In recorded debates I have already anticipated the arguments for this conclusion."

that in considering the subject of slavery, society seems to overlook the natural right, or personal interest of the slave himself, and to act exclusively for the welfare of the citizen. But this fact does not materially affect ultimate results, for the elementary question of the rightfulness or wrongfulness of slavery inheres in every form that discussion concerning it assumes. What is just to one class of men can never be injurious to any other; and what is unjust to any condition of persons in a state, is necessarily injurious in some degree to the whole community. An economical question early arises out of the subject of slavery—labor either of freemen or of slaves is the cardinal necessity of society. Some states choose the one kind, some the other. Hence, two municipal systems widely different arise. The slave state strikes down and affects to extinguish the personality of the laborer, not only as a member of the political body, but also as a parent, husband, child, neighbor or friend. He thus becomes, in a political view, merely property, without moral capacity, and without domestic, moral, and social relations, duties, rights, and remedies—a chattel, an object of bargain, sale, gift, inheritance or theft. His earnings are compensated and his wrongs atoned, not to himself, but to his owner. The state protects not the slave as a man, but the capital of another man, which he represents. On the other hand, the state which rejects slavery encourages and animates and invigorates the laborer by maintaining and developing his natural personality in all the rights and faculties of manhood, and generally with the privileges of citizenship. In the one case, capital invested in slaves becomes a great political force; while in the other, labor thus elevated and enfranchised, becomes the dominating political power. It thus happens that we may, for convenience sake, and not inaccurately, call slave states capital states, and free states labor states.

So soon as a state feels the impulses of commerce, or enterprise, or ambition, its citizens begin to study the effects of these systems of capital and labor respectively on its intelligence, its virtue, its tranquillity, its integrity or unity, its defense, its prosperity, its liberty, its happiness, its aggrandizement, and its fame. In other words, the great question arises, whether slavery is a moral, social and political good, or a moral, social and political evil. This is the slavery question at home. But there is a mutual bond of amity and brotherhood between man and man throughout the world. Nations examine freely the political

systems of each other, and of all preceding times, and accordingly as they approve or disapprove of the two systems of capital and labor respectively they sanction and prosecute, or condemn and prohibit, commerce in men. Thus, in one way or in another, the slavery question, which so many among us, who are more willing to rule than patient in studying the condition of society, think is a merely accidental or unnecessary question that might and ought to be settled and dismissed at once, is, on the contrary, a world-wide and enduring subject of political consideration and civil administration. Men, states and nations entertain it, not voluntarily, but because the progress of society continually brings it into their way. They divide upon it, not perversely, but because, owing to differences of constitution, condition or circumstances, they cannot agree.

The fathers of the republic encountered it. They even adjusted it so that it might have given us much less than our present disquiet, had not circumstances afterwards occurred which they, wise as they were, had not clearly foreseen. Although they had inherited, yet they generally condemned the practice of slavery, and hoped for its discontinuance. They expressed this when they asserted in the Declaration of Independence, as a fundamental principle of American society, that all men are created equal, and have inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Each state, however, reserved to itself exclusive political power over the subject of slavery within its own borders. Nevertheless, it unavoidably presented itself in their consultation on a bond of Federal Union. The new government was to be a representative one. Slaves were capital in some states, in others capital had no investments in labor. Should those slaves be represented as capital or as persons, taxed as capital or as persons, or should they not be represented or taxed at all? The fathers disagreed, debated long, and compromised at last. Each state, they determined, shall have two senators in congress. Three-fifths of the slaves shall be elsewhere represented, and be taxed as persons. What should be done if the slave should escape into a labor state? Should that state confess him to be a chattel, and restore him as such, or might it regard him as a person, and harbor and protect him as a man? They compromised again, and decided that no person held to labor or service in one state by the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, by any law or regulation of that state, be discharged

from such labor or service, but shall be delivered up on claim
the person to whom such labor or service shall be due.

Free laborers would immigrate, and slaves might be imported in
the states. The fathers agreed that congress may establish unifor
laws of naturalization, and it might prohibit the importation
persons after 1808. Communities in the southwest, detached fro
the southern states, were growing up, in the practice of slavery,
be capital states. New states would soon grow up in the northwe
while as yet capital stood aloof, and labor had not lifted the axe
begin there its endless but beneficent task. The fathers authoriz
congress to make all needful rules and regulations concerning t
management and disposition of the public lands, and to admit ne
states. So the constitution, while it does not disturb or affect t
system of capital in slaves, existing in any state under its own law
does, at the same time, recognize every human being when within a
exclusive sphere of federal jurisdiction, not as capital but as a perso

What was the action of the fathers in congress? They admitt
the new states of the southwest as capital states, because it w
practically impossible to do otherwise, and by the ordinance
1787, confirmed in 1789, they provided for the organization a
admission of only labor states in the northwest. They direct
fugitives from service to be restored not as chattels, but as perso
They awarded naturalization to immigrant free laborers, and th
prohibited the trade in African labor. This disposition of the whc
subject was in harmony with the conditions of society, and, in t
main, with the spirit of the age. The seven northern states conte
edly became labor states by their own acts. The six southern stat
with equal tranquillity, and by their own determination, remain
capital states.

The circumstances which the fathers did not clearly foresee we
two, namely, the reïnvigoration of slavery, consequent on t
increased consumption of cotton, and the extension of the nation
domain across the Mississippi, and these occurred before 1820. T
state of Louisiana, formed on a slaveholding French settleme
within the newly acquired Louisianian territory, had then alrea
been admitted into the Union. There yet remained, however, a va
region, which included Arkansas and Missouri, together with t
then unoccupied, and even unnamed, Kansas and Nebrask
Arkansas, a slaveholding community, was nearly ready to appl

and Missouri, another such territory, was actually applying for admission into the Federal Union. The existing capital states seconded these applications, and claimed that the whole Louisianian territory was rightfully open to slavery, and to the organization of future slave states. The labor states maintained that congress had supreme legislative power within the domain, and could and ought to exclude slavery there. The question thus opened was one which related not at all to slavery in the existing capital states. It was purely and simply a national question whether the common interest of the whole republic required that Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, should become capital states, with all the evils and dangers of slavery, or be labor states, with all the securities, benefits, and blessings of freedom. On the decision was suspended the question, as was thought, whether ultimately the interior of this new continent should be an asylum for the oppressed and the exile, coming year after year, and age after age, voluntarily from every other civilized land, as well as for the children of misfortune in our own, or whether, through the renewal of the African slave trade, those magnificent and luxuriant regions should be surrendered to the control of capital, wringing out the fruits of the earth through the impoverishing toil of negro slaves. That question of 1820 was identically the question of 1860, so far as principle, and even the field of its application, was concerned. Every element of the controversy now present entered it then; the rightfulness or the wrongfulness of slavery; its effects, present and future; the constitutional authority of congress; the claims of the states and of their citizens; the nature of the Federal Union, whether it is a compact between the states, or an independent government; the springs of its powers, and the ligatures upon their exercise. All these were discussed with zeal and ability which have never been surpassed. History tells us, I know not how truly, that the Union reeled under the vehemence of that great debate. Patriotism took counsel from prudence, and enforced a settlement which has proved to be not a final one; and which, as is now seen, practically left open all the great political issues which were involved. Missouri and Arkansas were admitted as capital states, while labor obtained, as a reservation, the abridged, but yet comprehensive field of Kansas and Nebraska.

Now, when the present conditions of the various parts of the Louisianian territory are observed, and we see that capital retains

undisputed possession of what it then obtained, while labor is c vulsing the country with so hard and so prolonged a struggl regain the lost equivalent, which was then guaranteed to it un circumstances of so great solemnity, we may well desire not to undeceived if the Missouri compromise was indeed unnecessa accepted by the free states, influenced by exaggerations of dangers of disunion. The Missouri debate disclosed truths of gr moment for ulterior use:

1st. That it is easy to combine the capital states in defense even external interests, while it is hard to unite the labor states i common policy.

2d. That the labor states have a natural loyalty to the Uni while the capital states have a natural facility for alarming that l alty by threatening disunion.

3d. That the capital states do not practically distinguish betw legitimate and constitutional resistance to the extension of slavery the common territories of the Union, and unconstitutional aggress against slavery established by local laws in the capital states.

The early political parties were organized without reference slavery. But since 1820, European questions have left us pra cally unconcerned. There has been a great increase of inventi mining, manufacture and cultivation. Steam on land and on wa has quickened commerce. The press and the telegraph have attain prodigious activity, and the social intercourse between the states a their citizens has been immeasurably augmented; and consequen their mutual relations affecting slavery have been, for many yea subjects of earnest and often excited discussion. It is in my w only to show how such disputes have operated on the course political events, not to reöpen them for argument here. There w a slave insurrection in Virginia. Virginia and Kentucky debat and, to the great sorrow of the free states, rejected the system voluntary labor. The colonization society was established w much favor in the capital states. Emancipation societies arose the free states. South Carolina instituted proceedings to null obnoxious federal revenue laws. The capital states complained courts and legislatures in the labor states, for interpreting the co stitutional provision for the surrender of fugitives from service, so to treat them as persons, and not property, and they discriminat against colored persons of the labor states, when they came to t

capital states. They denied in congress the right of petition, and embarrassed or denied freedom of debate on the subject of slavery. Presses, which undertook the defense of the labor system in the capital states, were suppressed by violence, and even in the labor states public assemblages, convened to consider slavery qustions, were dispersed by mobs sympathizing with the capital states.

The whig party, being generally an opposition party, practised some forbearance toward the interest of labor. The democratic party, not without demonstrations of dissent, was generally found sustaining the policy of capital. A disposition towards the removal of slavery from the presence of the national capital appeared in the District of Columbia. Mr. Van Buren, a democratic president, launched a prospective veto against the anticipated measure. A democratic congress brought Texas into the Union, stipulating practically for its future reörganization in four slave states. Mexico was incensed. War ensued. The labor states asked that the Mexican law of liberty, which covered the territories brought in by the treaty of peace, might remain and be confirmed. The democratic party refused. The Missouri debate of 1820 recurred now, under circumstances of heat and excitement, in relation to these conquests. The defenders of labor took alarm lest the number of new capital states might become so great as to enable that class of states to dictate the whole policy of the government; and in case of constitutional resistance, then to form a new slaveholding confederacy around the gulf of Mexico. By this time the capital states seemed to have become fixed in a determination that the federal government, and even the labor states, should recognize their slaves, though outside of the slave states, and within the territories of the United States, as property of which the master could not be in any way, or by any authority, divested; and the labor states having become now more essentially democratic than ever before, by reason of the great development of free labor, more firmly than ever insisted on the constitutional doctrine, that slaves voluntarily carried by their masters into the common territories or into labor states, are persons—men.

Under the auspicious influence of a whig success, California and New Mexico appeared before congress as labor states. The capital states refused to consent to their admission into the Union; and again threats of disunion carried terror and consternation throughout the land. Another compromise was made. Specific enactments

admitted California as a labor state, and ren
Utah to remain territories, with the righ
slavery when ripened into states, while t
for the recaption of fugitives from service,
slave market in the District of Columbia.
collated with the existing statutes, namely, t
Missouri prohibitory law of 1820, and the a
tion, disposed by law of the subject of slav
of the United States. And so the compr
nounced a full, final, absolute and comprel
existing and all possible disputes concernin
ral authority. The two great parties, fear
hands in making and in presenting this a
afterwards to be opened, disturbed or even
ple accepted it by majorities unknown bef
chosen over an illustrious rival, unequivo
greater ability, even if not more reliable p
new treaty inviolate, made haste to justif
congress assembled. He said:

"When the grave shall have closed over all who a
the obligations of duty, the year 1850 will be recurr
anxiety and apprehension. A successful war has ju
with it a great augmentation of territory. Distur
upon the domestic institutions of a portion of the co
constitutional rights of the states. But, notwithsta
and sentiment, in relation to details and specific pr
distinguished citizens, whose devotion to the Unio
given renewed vigor to our institutions, and rest
repose to the public mind throughout the confeder
suffer no shock during my official term, if I have the
placed me here may be assured."

Hardly, however, had these inspiring sou
out a reassured and delighted land, before t
shocked again—shocked, indeed, as it had
smitten this time by a blow from the very
leased the chords of the national harp from
exalted symphony of peace.

Kansas and Nebraska, the long-devoted r
freedom, saved in the agony of national f
again in the panic of 1850, were now to be

the never-ending course of seed-time and harvest might begin. The slave capitalists of Missouri, from their own well-assured homes on the eastern banks of their noble river, looked down upon and coveted the fertile prairies of Kansas; while a sudden terror ran through all the capital states, when they saw a seeming certainty that at last a new labor state would be built on their western border, inevitably fraught, as they said, with a near or remote abolition of slavery. What could be done? Congress could hardly be expected to intervene directly for their safety so soon after the compromise of 1850. The labor hive of the free states was distant—the way new, unknown and not without perils. Missouri was near and watchful, and held the keys of the gates of Kansas. She might seize the new and smiling territory by surprise, if only congress would remove the barrier established in 1820. The conjuncture was favorable. Clay and Webster, the distinguished citizens whose unquestionable devotion to the Union was manifested by their acquiescence in the compromise of 1850, had gone down already into their honored graves. The labor states had dismissed many of their representatives here for too great fidelity to freedom, and too great distrust of the efficacy of that new bond of peace, and had replaced them with partisans who were only timid, but not unwilling. The democratic president and congress hesitated, but not long. They revised the last great compromise, and found, with delighted surprise, that it was so far from confirming the law of freedom of 1820, that, on the other hand, it exactly provided for the abrogation of that venerated statute; nay, that the compromise itself actually killed the spirit of the Missouri law, and devolved on congress the duty of removing the lifeless letter from the national code. The deed was done. The new enactment not only repealed the Missouri prohibition of slavery, but it pronounced the people of Kansas and Nebraska perfectly free to establish freedom or slavery, and pledged congress to admit them in due time as states, either of capital or of labor, into the Union. The whig representatives of the capital states, in an hour of strange bewilderment, concurred; and the whig party instantly went down, never to rise again. Democrats seceded, and stood aloof; the country was confounded; and, amid the perplexities of the hour, a republican party was seen gathering itself together with much earnestness, but with little show of organization, to rescue, if it were not

now too late, the cause of freedom and labor, so unexpectedly a grievously imperiled in the territories of the United States.

I will not linger over the sequel. The popular sovereignty Kansas proved to be the state sovereignty of Missouri, not only the persons of the rulers, but even in the letter of an arbitrary a cruel code. The perfect freedom proved to be a hateful and intol able bondage. From 1855 to 1860, Kansas, sustained and enc raged only by the republican party, has been engaged in success and ever-varying struggles, which have taxed all her virtue, wisdo moderation, energies, and resources, and often even her physi strength and martial courage, to save herself from being betray into the Union as a slave state. Nebraska, though choosing fr dom, is, through the direct exercise of the executive power, ov riding her own will, held as a slave territory; and New Mex has relapsed voluntarily into the practice of slavery, from which s had redeemed herself while she yet remained a part of the Mexic republic. Meantime the democratic party, advancing from t ground of popular sovereignty as far as that ground is from t ordinance of 1787, now stands on the position that both territor governments and congress are incompetent to legislate against slave in the territories, while they are not only competent, but are oblig when it is necessary, to legislate for its protection there.

In this new and extreme position the democratic party now ma itself behind the battery of the supreme court, as if it were possi a true construction of the constitution, that the power of decidi practically forever between freedom and slavery in a portion of t continent far exceeding all that is yet organized, should be renoun by congress, which alone possesses any legislative authority, a should be assumed and exercised by a court which can only take c nizance of the great question collaterally, in a private action betw individuals, and which action the constitution will not suffer the co to entertain, if it involves twenty dollars of money, without overruling intervention of a jury of twelve good and lawful men the neighborhood where the litigation arises. The independent, ev renewed, and ever-recurring representative parliament, diet, congr or legislature, is the one chief, paramount, essential, indispensa institution in a republic. Even liberty, guaranteed by organic l yet if it be held by other tenure than the guardian care of suc representative popular assembly, is but precariously maintain

while slavery, enforced by an irresponsible judicial tribunal, is the completest possible development of despotism.

Did ever the annals of any government show a more rapid or more complete departure from the wisdom and virtue of its founders? Did ever the government of a great empire, founded on the rights of human labor, slide away so fast and so far, and moor itself so tenaciously on the basis of capital, and that capital invested in laboring men? Did ever a free representative legislature, invested with powers so great, and with the guardianship of rights so important, of trusts so sacred, of interests so precious, and of hopes at once so noble and so comprehensive, surrender and renounce them all so unnecessarily, so unwisely, so fatally, and so ingloriously? If it be true, as every instinct of our nature, and every precept of political experience teaches us, that

> "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;"

then where in Ireland, in Italy, in Poland, or in Hungary, has any ruler prepared for a generous and confiding people disappointments, disasters, and calamities equal to those which the government of the United States holds now suspended over so large a portion of the continent of North America?

Citizens of the United States, in the spirit of this policy, subverted the free republic of Nicaragua, and opened it to slavery and the African slave trade, and held it in that condition waiting annexation to the United States, until its sovereignty was restored by a combination of sister republics exposed to the same danger, and apprehensive of similar subversion. Other citizens reöpened the foreign slave trade in violation of our laws and treaties; and, after a suspension of that shameful traffic for fifty years, savage Africans have been once more landed on our shores and distributed, unreclaimed and with impunity, among our plantations.

For this policy, so far as the government has sanctioned it, the democratic party avows itself responsible. Everywhere complaint against it is denounced, and its opponents proscribed. When Kansas was writhing under the wounds of incipient, servile war, because of her resistance, the democratic press deridingly said, "Let her bleed." Official integrity has been cause for rebuke and punishment, when it resisted frauds designed to promote the extension of slavery. Throughout the whole republic there is not one known

dissenter from that policy remaining in pl
executive arm. Nor over the face of the
found one representative of our country w
the extension of slavery.

It is in America that these things have
teenth century, the era of the world's gr
all nations but ourselves have been eith
suppressing commerce in men; at the ver
sian serf is emancipated, and the Georgian
ner, and the Abyssinian savage are lift
successor of Mohammed. The world, pre
our early devotion to the rights of human
before engaged its respect and sympath
amazement, what all this demoralization m
better than the world can imagine, better
scious of ourselves—a virtuous excuse.
dom so much less, but the Union of ou
We have been made to believe, from time
both of these precious institutions could
therefore we have, from time to time, s
freedom to propitiate the loyalty of capital
doing violence to the Union. The true s
ought not to be a mystery to ourselves.
given to statesmen; but we are withou
apprehend the logic of current events. L
ment choose or do what they may, the pe
do not prefer the wealth of the few to the
tal to labor, African slaves to white freem
ries and in future states. That question
recognized or acted on by them. The rep
popular protest and reäction against a polic
upon the nation by surprise, and which i
concurring with the reason and conscience

The choice of the nation is now between
the republican party. Its principles and p
and even necessarily examined. I know
it has adopted or avowed, namely, the savi
United States, if possible, by constitution
being homes for slavery and polygamy.

this nation exists, of what races it is composed, in what age of the world it acts its part on the public stage, and what are its predominant institutions, customs, habits and sentiments, doubts that the republican party can and will, if unwaveringly faithful to that policy, and just and loyal in all beside, carry it into triumphal success? To doubt is to be uncertain whether civilization can improve or Christianity save mankind.

I may, perhaps, infer from the necessity of the case, that it will, in all courts and places, stand by the freedom of speech and of the press, and will maintain the constitutional rights of freemen everywhere; that it will favor the speedy improvement of the public domain by homestead laws, and will encourage mining, manufacture and internal commerce, with needful connections between the Atlantic and Pacific states—for all these are important interests of freedom. For all the rest, the national emergencies, not individual influences, must determine, as society goes on, the policy and character of the republican party. Already bearing its part in legislation and in treaties, it feels the necessity of being practical in its care of the national health and life, while it leaves metaphysical speculation to those whose duty it is to cultivate the ennobling science of political philosophy.

But in the midst of these subjects, or rather before fully reaching them, the republican party encounters, unexpectedly, a new and potential issue—one prior, and therefore paramount to all others, one of national life and death. Just as if so much had not been already conceded—nay, just as if nothing at all had ever been conceded to the interest of capital invested in men, we hear menaces of disunion, louder, more distinct, more emphatic, than ever, with the condition annexed, that they shall be executed the moment that a republican administration, though constitutionally elected, shall assume the government.

I do not certainly know that the people are prepared to call such an administration to power. I know only, that through a succession of floods which never greatly excite, and ebbs which never entirely discourage me, the volume of republicanism rises continually higher and higher. They are probably wise, whose apprehensions admonish them that it is already strong enough for effect.

Hitherto the republican party has been content with one self-interrogatory—how many votes can it cast? These threats enforce

another—has it determination enough to
question touches its spirit and pride. I am
as it has hitherto practised self-denial in so
in this emergency lay aside all impatience
all ambition, and will consider these extraor
ously and with a just moderation. It woul
demonstrate that they are unconstitutional,
that the responsibility for disunion attempt
not with those who, in the exercise of consti
tain the government, but with those who u
in the mad work of subverting it.

What are the excuses for these menace
selves into this, that the republican party in
the south. But it already is proved to be a
it is therefore practically the people of the
be the same north that has forborne with y
to you so much? Can you justly assume t
been so complying, can all at once chang
inexorable?

You say that the republican party is
democratic party less sectional? Is it eas
sectional sway than for you to bear ours?
for once we should alternate? But is the re
Not unless the democratic party is. The r
in the house of representatives sometimes;
the senate always. Which of the two is
Come, come, come, if you will, into the fre
New York, anywhere from lake Erie to
neighbors in the Owasco valley, hold you
your candidates, address the people, submit
eloquently, all your complaints and grieva
alty, oppression, perfidy; keep nothing ba
and loudly there as you do here; you will h
and appreciating audiences, with ballot-box
you can win. Are you less sectional than
same privileges, and I will engage that you
the south as many republicans as we have
There is, however, a better test of nations
location of parties. Our policy of labor in

sectional in the first forty years of the republic. Its nature inheres. It will be national again, during the third forty years, and forever afterwards. It is not wise and beneficent for us alone or injurious to you alone. Its effects are equal, and the same for us all.

You accuse the republican party of ulterior and secret designs. How can a party that counts its votes in this land of free speech and free press by the hundreds of thousands, have any secret designs? Who is the conjurer, and where are the hidden springs by which he can control its uncongregated and widely-dispersed masses, and direct them to objects unseen and purposes unavowed? But what are these hidden purposes? You name only one. That one is to introduce negro equality among you. Suppose we had the power to change your social system: what warrant have you for supposing that we should carry negro equality there? We know, and we will show you, if you will only give heed, that what our system of labor works out, wherever it works out anything, is the equality of white men. The laborer in the free states, no matter how humble his occupation, is a white man, and he is politically the equal of his employer. Eighteen of our thirty-three states are free-labor states. They are: Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, California, and Oregon. I do not array them in contrast with the capital states. I am no assailant of states. All of the states are parcels of my own country—the best of them not so wise and great as I am sure it will hereafter be; the state least developed and perfected among them all is wiser and better than any foreign state I know. Is it then in any, and in which, of the states I have named that negro equality offends the white man's pride? Throughout the wide world, where is the state where class and caste are so utterly extinguished as they are in each and every one of them? Let the European immigrant, who avoids the African as if his skin exhaled contagion, answer. You find him always in the state where labor is ever free. Did Washington, Jefferson, and Henry, when they implored you to relinquish your system and accept the one we have adopted, propose to sink you down to the level of the African, or was it their desire to exalt all white men to a common political elevation?

But we do not seek to force, or even to intrude, our system on you. We are excluded justly, wisely and contentedly from all political

power and responsibility in your capital states. You are sovereign on the subject of slavery within your own borders, as we are on the same subject within our borders. It is well and wisely so arranged. Use your authority to maintain what system you please. We are not distrustful of the result. We have wisely, as we think, exercised ours to protect and perfect the manhood of the members of the state. The whole sovereignty upon domestic concerns within the Union, is divided between us by unmistakable boundaries. You have your fifteen distinct parts; we eighteen parts, equally distinct. Each must be maintained in order that the whole may be preserved. If ours shall be assailed, within or without, by any enemy, or for any cause, and we shall have need, we shall expect you to defend it. If yours shall be so assailed, in the emergency, no matter what the cause or the pretext, or who the foe, we shall defend your sovereignty as the equivalent of our own. We cannot, indeed, accept your system of capital or its ethics. That would be to surrender and subvert our own, which we esteem to be better. Besides, if we could, what need for any division into states at all? You are equally at liberty to reject our system and its ethics, and to maintain the superiority of your own by all the forces of persuasion and argument. We must, indeed, mutually discuss both systems. All the world discusses all systems. Especially must we discuss them since we have to decide as a nation which of the two we ought to engraft on the new and future states growing up in the great public domain. Discussion, then, being unavoidable, what could be more wise than to conduct it with mutual toleration and in a fraternal spirit?

You complain that republicans discourse too boldly and directly, when they express with confidence their belief that the system of labor will, in the end, be universally accepted by the capital states, acting for themselves and in conformity with their own constitutions, while they sanction too unreservedly books designed to advocate emancipation. But surely you can hardly expect the federal government or the political parties of the nation to maintain a censorship of the press or of debate. Would you yourselves consent to the establishment of such a censorship as a permanent institution? The theory of our system is, that error of opinion may in all cases safely be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. Will it be claimed that more of moderation and tenderness in debate are exhibited on your side of the great argument than on our own? We all learned

our polemics, as well as our principles, from a common master. We are sure that we do not, on our side, exceed his lessons and example. Thomas Jefferson addressed Dr. Price, an Englishman, concerning his treatise on emancipation in America, in this fashion:

"Southward of the Chesapeake your book will find but few readers concurring with it in sentiment on the subject of slavery. From the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake, the bulk of the people will approve it in theory, and it will find a respectable minority ready to adopt it in practice—a minority which, for weight and worth of character, preponderates against the greater number who have not the courage to divest their families of a property which, however, keeps their consciences unquiet. Northward of the Chesapeake you may find here and there an opponent to your doctrine, as you may find here and there a robber or a murderer; but in no greater number." * * * * "This (Virginia) is the next state to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression—a conflict where the sacred side is gaining daily new recruits from the influx into office of young men, grown and growing up." * * * * * * * "Be not, then, discouraged. What you have written will do a great deal of good; and could you still trouble yourself about our welfare, no man is more able to help the laboring side."

You see that whether we go for or against slavery anywhere, we must follow southern guides. You may change your pilots with the winds or the currents, but we, whose nativity, reckoned under the north star, has rendered us somewhat superstitious, must be excused for constancy in following the guidance of those who framed the national ship and gave us the chart for its noble voyage.

A profound respect and a friendly regard for the vice-president of the United States, has induced me to weigh carefully the testimony he has given on the subject of the hostility against the south, imputed to the republican party, as derived from the relations of the representatives of the two parties at this capital. He says that he has seen here in the representatives of the lower southern states a most resolute and earnest spirit of resistance to the republican party; that he perceives a sensible loss of that spirit of brotherhood and that feeling of loyalty, together with that love for a common country, which are at last the surest cement of the Union; so that, in the present unhappy condition of affairs, he is almost tempted to exclaim that we are dissolving week by week and month by month; that the threads are gradually fretting themselves asunder; and a stranger might suppose that the executive of the United States was the president of two hostile republics. It is not for me to raise a doubt

upon the correctness of this dark picture, so far as the south groups upon the canvas are concerned, but I must be indulged the opinion that I can pronounce as accurately concerning the no ern or republican representatives here as any one. I know t public haunts and their private ways. We are not a hostile repu or representatives of one. We confer together, but only as organs of every party do and must do in a political system wh obliges us to act sometimes as partisans, while it requires us alw to be patriots and statesmen. Differences of opinion, even on subject of slavery, with us are political, not social or personal, ferences. There is not one disunionist or disloyalist among us We are altogether unconscious of any process of dissolution go on among us or around us. We have never been more patient, never loved the representatives of other sections more than n We bear the same testimony for the people around us here, w though in the very centre where the bolt of disunion must fall f and with most fearful effect, seem less disturbed now than e before. We bear the same testimony for all the districts and sta we represent. The people of the north are not enemies, but frie and brethren of the south, faithful and true as in the days wh death has dealt his arrows promiscuously among them on comm battle-fields of freedom.

We will not suffer ourselves here to dwell on any evidence o different temper in the south; but we shall be content with expre ing our belief that hostility that is not designedly provoked, and t cannot provoke retaliation, is an anomaly that must be traced casual excitements, which cannot perpetuate alienation.

A canvass for a presidential election, in some respects more imp tant perhaps than any since 1800, has recently begun. The ho of representatives was to be organized by a majority, while no pa could cast more than a plurality of votes. The gloom of the l tragedy in Virginia rested on the capitol from the day when congr assembled. While the two great political parties were peaceful lawfully and constitutionally, though zealously, conducting the gr national issue between free labor and capital labor for the territo to its proper solution, through the trials of the ballot, operat directly or indirectly on the various departments of the governme a band of exceptional men, contemptuous equally of that gr question and of the parties to the controversy, and impatient of

constitutional system which confines the citizens of every state to political action by suffrage, in organized parties within their own borders, inspired by an enthusiasm peculiar to themselves, and exasperated by grievances and wrongs that some of them had suffered by inroads of armed propagandists of slavery in Kansas, unlawful as their own retaliation was, attempted to subvert slavery in Virginia by conspiracy, ambush, invasion and force. The method we have adopted, of appealing to the reason and judgment of the people, to be pronounced by suffrage, is the only one by which free government can be maintained anywhere, and the only one as yet devised which is in marked harmony with the spirit of the Christian religion. While generous and charitable natures will probably concede that John Brown and his associates acted on earnest though fatally erroneous convictions, yet all good citizens will nevertheless agree that this attempt to execute an unlawful purpose in Virginia by invasion, involving servile war, was an act of sedition and treason, and criminal in just the extent that it affected the public peace and was destructive of human happiness and human life. It is a painful reflection that, after so long an experience of the beneficent working of our system as we have enjoyed, we have had these new illustrations in Kansas and Virginia of the existence among us of a class of men so misguided and so desperate as to seek to enforce their peculiar principles by the sword, drawing after it a need for the further illustration by their punishment of that great moral truth, especially applicable in a republic, that they who take up the sword as a weapon of controversy, shall perish by the sword. In the latter case, the lamented deaths of so many citizens, slain from an ambush and by surprise—all the more lamentable because they were innocent victims of a frenzy kindled without their agency, in far distant fires—the deaths even of the offenders themselves, pitiable, although necessary and just, because they acted under delirium, which blinded their judgments to the real nature of their criminal enterprise; the alarm and consternation naturally awakened throughout the country, exciting, for the moment, the fear that our whole system, with all its securities for life and liberty, was coming to an end—a fear none the more endurable because continually aggravated by new chimeras to which the great leading event lent an air of probability; surely all these constituted a sum of public misery, which ought to have satisfied the most morbid appetite for social horrors. But, as in the case

of the gunpowder plot, and the Salem witchcraft, and the New York colonial negro plot, so now; the original actors were swiftly followed by another and kindred class, who sought to prolong and widen the public distress by attempting to direct the indignation which it had excited, against parties guiltless equally of complicity and of sympathy with the offenders.

Posterity will decide in all the recent cases where political responsibility for public disasters must fall; and posterity will give little heed to our interested instructions. It was not until the gloomy reign of Domitian had ended, and liberty and virtue had found assured refuge under the sway of the milder Nerva, that the historian arose whose narrative of that period of tyranny and terror has been accepted by mankind.

The republican party being thus vindicated against the charge of hostility to the south which has been offered in excuse for the menaces of unconstitutional resistance in the event of its success, I feel well assured that it will sustain me in meeting them in the spirit of the defender of the English commonwealth:

"Surely they that shall boast as we do to be a free nation, and having the power, shall not also have the courage to remove, constitutionally, every governor, whether he be the supreme or subordinate, may please their fancy with a ridiculous and painted freedom, fit to cozen babies, but are, indeed, under tyranny and servitude, as wanting that power, which is the root and source of all liberty, to dispose of and economize in the land which God hath given them, of members of family in their own home and free inheritance. Without which natural and essential power of a free nation, though bearing their heads, they can, in due esteem, be thought no better than slaves and vassals born in the tenure and occupation of another inheriting lord, whose government, though not illegal or intolerable, hangs on them as a lordly scourge, not as a free government."

The republican party knows, as the whole country will ultimately come to understand, that the noblest objects of national life must perish, if that life itself shall be lost, and, therefore, it will accept the issue tendered. It will take up the word Union, which others are so willing to renounce, and, combining it with that other glorious thought, Liberty, which has been its inspiration so long, it will move firmly onward, with the motto inscribed on its banner, "UNION and LIBERTY, come what may, in victory as in defeat, in power as out of power, now and forever."

If the republican party maintain the Union, who and what party is to assail it? Only the democratic party, for there is no other.

Will the democratic party take up the assault? The menaces of disunion are made, though not in its name, yet in its behalf. It must avow or disavow them. Its silence, thus far, is portentous, but is not alarming. The effect of the intimidation, if successful, would be to continue the rule of the democratic party, though a minority, by terror. It certainly ought to need no more than this to secure the success of the republican party. If, indeed, the time has come when the democratic party must rule by terror, instead of ruling through conceded public confidence, then it is quite certain that it cannot be dismissed from power too soon. Ruling on that odious principle, it could not long save either the constitution or public liberty. But I shall not believe the democratic party will consent to stand in this position, though it does, through the action of its representatives, seem to cover and sustain those who threaten disunion. I know the democracy of the north. I know them now in their waning strength. I do not know a possible disunionist among them all. I believe they will be as faithful to the Union now as they were in the bygone days when their ranks were full, and their challenge to the combat was always the war-cry of victory. But, if it shall prove otherwise, then the world will all the sooner know that every party in this country must stand on Union ground; that the American people will sustain no party that is not capable of making a sacrifice of its ambition on the altar of the country; that although a party may have never so much of prestige, and never such traditional merit, yet, if it be lacking in the one virtue of loyalty to the Union, all its advantages will be unavailing; and then obnoxious as, through long-cherished and obstinate prejudices, the republican party is in the capital states, yet even there it will advance like an army with banners, winning the favor of the whole people, and it will be armed with the national confidence and support, when it shall be found the only party that defends and maintains the integrity of the Union.

Those who seek to awaken the terrors of disunion seem to me to have too hastily considered the conditions under which they are to make their attempt. Who believes that a republican administration and congress could practise tyranny under a constitution which interposes so many checks as ours? Yet that tyranny must not only be practised, but must be intolerable, and there must be no remain-

ing hope for constitutional relief, before forcible resistance can find ground to stand on anywhere.

The people of the United States, acting in conformity with the constitution, are the supreme tribunal to try and determine all political issues. They are as competent to decide the issues of to-day as they have been heretofore to decide the issues of other days. They can reconsider hereafter, and reverse, if need be, the judgment they shall pronounce to-day, as they have more than once reconsidered and reversed their judgments in former times. It needs no revolution to correct any error, or prevent any danger, under any circumstances.

Nor is any new or special cause for revolution likely to occur under a republican administration. We are engaged in no new transaction, not even in a new dispute. Our fathers undertook a great work for themselves, for us, and for our successors—to erect a free and federal empire, whose arches shall span the North American continent, and reflect the rays of the sun throughout his whole passage from the one to the other of the great oceans. They erected thirteen of its columns all at once. These are standing now, the admiration of mankind. Their successors added twenty more; even we who are here have shaped and elevated three of those twenty, and all these are as firm and steadfast as the first thirteen; and more will yet be necessary when we shall have rested from our labors. Some among us prefer for these columns a composite material; others the pure white marble. Our fathers and our predecessors differed in the same way, and on the same point. What execrations should we not all unite in pronouncing on any statesman who heretofore, from mere disappointment and disgust at being overruled in his choice of materials for any new column then to be quarried, should have laid violent hands on the imperfect structure, and brought it down to the earth, there to remain a wreck, instead of a citadel of a world's best hopes!

I remain now in the opinion I have uniformly expressed here and elsewhere, that these hasty threats of disunion are so unnatural that they will find no hand to execute them. We are of one race, language, liberty and faith, engaged, indeed, in varied industry; but even that industry, so diversified, brings us into more intimate relations with each other than any other people, however homogeneous, and though living under a consolidated government, ever maintained.

We languish throughout, if one joint of our federal frame is smitten; while it is certain that a part dissevered must perish. You may refine as you please about the structure of the government, and say that it is a compact, and that a breach, by one of the states or by congress, of any one article, absolves all the members from allegiance, and that the states may separate when they have, or fancy they have, cause for war. But once try to subvert it, and you will find that it is a government of the whole people—as individuals, as well as a compact of states; that every individual member of the body politic is conscious of his interest and power in it, and knows that he will be helpless, powerless, hopeless, when it shall have gone down. Mankind have a natural right, a natural instinct, and a natural capacity for self-government; and when, as here, they are sufficiently ripened by culture, they will and must have self-government, and no other. The framers of our constitution, with a wisdom that surpassed all previous understanding among men, adapted it to these inherent elements of human nature. He strangely, blindly, misunderstands the anatomy of the great system who thinks that its only bonds, or even its strongest ligaments, are the written compact or even the multiplied and thoroughly ramified roads and thoroughfares of trade, commerce and social intercourse. These are strong indeed; but its chiefest instruments of cohesion—those which render it inseparable and indivisible—are the millions of fibres of millions of contented, happy human hearts, binding by their affections, their ambitions and their best hopes, equally the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the wise and the unwise, the learned and the untutored, even the good and the bad, to a government, the first, the last, and the only such one that has ever existed, which takes equal heed always of their wants, their wishes and their opinions; and appeals to them all, individually, once in a year, or two years, or at least in four years, for their expressed consent and renewal, without which it must cease. No; go where you will, and to what class you may, with commissions for your fatal service in one hand, and your bounty counted by the hundred or the thousand pieces of silver in the other, a thousand resisters will rise up for every recruit you can engage. On the banks equally of the St. Lawrence and of the Rio Grande, on the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, on the shores of the gulf of Mexico, and in the delves of the Rocky mountains, among the fishermen on the banks of Newfoundland, the weavers and

spinners of Massachusetts, the stevedores of New York, the miner of Pennsylvania, Pike's Peak and California, the wheat-growers o Indiana, the cotton and the sugar planters on the Mississippi, amon the voluntary citizens from every other land, not less than the nativ born, the Christian and the Jew, among the Indians on the prairie the contumacious Mormons in Deseret, the Africans free, the Afr cans in bondage, the inmates of hospitals and alms-houses, and eve the criminals in the penitentiaries, rehearse the story of your wrong and their own, never so eloquently and never so mournfully, an appeal to them to rise. They will ask you, "Is this all?" "Ar you more just than Washington, wiser than Hamilton, more human than Jefferson?" "What new form of government or of unio have you the power to establish, or even the cunning to devise, tha will be more just, more safe, more free, more gentle, more benefi cent, or more glorious than this?" And by these simple interroga tories you will be silenced and confounded.

We are perpetually forgetting this subtle and complex, yet obvious and natural mechanism of our constitution; and because we do for get it, we are continually wondering how it is that a confederacy of thirty and more states, covering regions so vast, and regulating interests so various of so many millions of men, constituted and conditioned so diversely, works right on. We are continually looking to see it stop and stand still, or fall suddenly into pieces. But, in truth, it will not stop; it cannot stop; it was made not to stop, but to keep in motion—in motion always, and without force. For my own part, as this wonderful machine, when it had newly com from the hands of its almost divine inventors, was the admiratio of my earlier years, although it was then but imperfectly known abroad, so now, when it forms the central figure in the economy of the world's civilization, and the best sympathies of mankind favo its continuance, I expect that it will stand and work right on until men shall fear its failure no more than we now apprehend that the sun will cease to hold his eternal place in the heavens.

Nevertheless, I do not expect to see this purely popular though majestic system always working on unattended by the presence and exhibition of human temper and human passions. That would be to expect to enjoy rewards, benefits and blessings, without labor care and watchfulness—an expectation contrary to divine appoint ment. These are the discipline of the American citizen, and be

must inure himself to it. When, as now, a great policy, fastened upon the country through its doubts and fears, confirmed by its habits, and strengthened by personal interests and ambitions, is to be relaxed and changed, in order that the nation may have its just and natural and free developments, then, indeed, all the winds of controversy are let loose upon us from all points of the political compass—we see objects and men only through mazes, mists, and doubtful and lurid lights. The earth seems to be heaving under our feet, and the pillars of the noble fabric that protects us to be trembling before our eyes. But the appointed end of all this agitation comes at last, and always seasonably; the tumults of the people subside; the country becomes calm once more; and then we find that only our senses have been disturbed, and that they have betrayed us. The earth is firm as always before, and the wonderful structure, for whose safety we have feared so anxiously, now more firmly fixed than ever, still stands unmoved, enduring and immovable.

NOTE—THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY IN 1856.—In 1855–6 the state of the country was hardly less disturbed than in 1860–1. Threats of rebellion and secession abounded in congress and in the southern states. The following extract is from a speech made by Mr. Seward in the senate March 12, 1856:

"My own idea is, that there is no necessity for violence or civil war; and that, if prudence and moderation be exercised in congress, this great question, like all others, will finally reach its settlement without disturbing the peace of the country, or endangering the safety of the Union; but, at the same time, it is not conducive to such a settlement of it to add anything more to the terrors which impend over the settlers in Kansas. I suppose, from what I hear in these reports, that the people of Kansas will be here as a free state, and will appear by senators in congress authorized to present their constitution. When they come it will be a question to be settled here, and not elsewhere. Let me say, by way of caution, that he was a wise man who remarked that 'it is the misfortune of mankind that just on those occasions on which the greatest calmness and reason are most necessary, those are just the occasions on which calmness and reason are most likely to be forgotten.' For my own part, I propose to remain cool—to meet this question here, in this place, on its own merits; and, if I can, to secure the admission of the state of Kansas into this Union under the constitution which she has adopted, and which she is preparing to submit for our acceptance."

NOTE TO PAGE 637.—John Brown. Alexander Hamilton said of André: "Never, perhaps, did any man suffer death with more justice or deserve it less." *Ed.*

SECESSION

Note—The New England Dinner.—The annual ı
society of New York was held at the Astor House oı
December, 1860. Mr. Seward had declined a courtec
and his letter of declination had been read at the tabl
arrive at the Astor House about eleven o'clock that e
from Auburn to Washington, he was literally forced
were about to break up. The secession movements
thoughts of everybody. Mr. Seward had reasons for
which were unknown to the public. His speech e
Although not made in the senate it properly finds a p
those delivered in that body on the same subject.

These are extraordinary times, and ex
transpiring in our day, and it was men of N
in a period only two or three times as long ı
life I have lived, I remember that these me
vented the greatest political discovery of the
of republican states in America. The first con
states in America, was the invention of men
great discovery after having been in successful
years in the colonies of Massachusetts Bay a
necticut and New Haven, and after having
wisdom and experience of Dr. Franklin—
adopted by the people of the thirteen Britisl
nent south of the river St. Lawrence. It ha
day and for this very hour to witness an inv
—of an opposite nature—by a portion of ou
south of the Potomac.

The Yankees invented confederation—the
lina have invented secession. The wisdom c
against the experience of the former. At fi
singularly anomaly—a state which has, in th
States, two seats, a state consisting of seven

ple of all conditions, and of whom two hundred and seventy-four thousand are white, having two seats in the senate of the United States, equal to the representation of any other state in the Union, and having six members in the house of representatives, each of them paid three thousand dollars a year out of a treasury to which they contribute a very small part—going out of the Union to stand by itself, and to send to the congress of the United States three commissioners, to stand outside of the bar and negotiate for their interests, and be paid by themselves, instead of two senators and six representatives in congress—equal members with all the representatives in the confederacy. This is the experiment which is to be tried. Whether states of North America will find it wise to refuse to occupy seats within the halls of congress of the United States, to be paid by the United States for going there, and to exercise the powers conferred upon them as such representatives, or in lieu of that send commissioners to present their claims, will be seen in the sequel. This is the latest political invention of the times. I must say to you that I do not think it is likely to be followed by many other states on this continent, or to be persevered in long, because it is manifestly very much inferior to the system which already exists.

The state of South Carolina desires to go out of the Union, and just at the moment I am going back to Washington for the purpose of admitting Kansas in. I venture to say further that for every state on this continent which will go out of the Union and stay out, there stand ready at least two states on this continent of North America who will be glad to come in, and take their places with us. They will do so for this simple reason, that every state on this continent must be a democratic or republican state. You gentlemen from New England don't like to hear the word democratic always, therefore I use the word republican. No republican state on this continent, or any other, can stand alone; and the reason is a simple one. So much liberty, so much individual independence, so much scope for rivalry and emulation, are too much of freedom for any one state, standing singly, to maintain. Therefore, it is, as you have seen, that the moment it was thought there was to be a break in this great national confederacy, you began to hear at once of secession, not only in South Carolina, but also in California—secession in New England, and last, the secession of New York city and Long Island from the state of New York. Admit the right to dissolve this

American Union, and there is no one state
new associations for either advantage or saf
ally the principles of secession, we shall go
into the condition of the people of Central

Republican states are like sheaves in the
up singly and they are liable to be blown
wind. Stack them together and they defy
so you have seen that these thirteen republ
conviction, severally, that they could not
thirteen came together. What under He
Michigan, the states of Illinois, Indiana, Wi
—what kept each of these states from settir
independence. Nothing, but the conviction
alone, and so each claimed the right to be u
lican states of this continent. So it was
independent—why did she not remain so?
it tried us to admit her into the Union, but
to stay out so long. Why is not Kansas
Simply because of the sympathy and intere
republican states on this continent shall be o
Alabama, Louisiana, or any other state g
rushing out you will see Canada and all the
ing to rush in. It is the system discovered
concentrated in those three words, "*E Pl*
no such thing as one separated from the m

And now one word concerning the ano
affairs—produced by this frenzy of some o
secede from the Union. It has taken the *A*
world by surprise? Why has it taken the
because it is unwise and unnatural. It is
can states of this continent should be cor
that any of them should attempt to separ
to have taken us by surprise. Whoever c
a machine so complicated, so vast, so new,
ted system of republican states, should be
lot of states which have figured in the hi
more complex system of political governr
never conceived, among men. How strang
it is, that we should be surprised that a pi

out of this machinery, and that the wheels shall drag, or that the gudgeon shall be worn, until the wheels themselves shall cease to play with their regular activity. What human society was ever exempted from the experience of a necessity of repairing its political system of government for more than a period of seventy years? We have tried it in our state. Every state in this Union is just like the federal government. No state is more than seventy years old, and there is not any one state of this Union with a constitution which is more than twenty-five years old—every state has repaired and remodeled its constitution once in every twenty-five years, and it is not certain that any one state can adopt a constitution which will last more than twenty-five years without being repaired and restored. But in our own state the constitution adopted about twenty-five years ago, contains a provision, that in 1866, without any special appeal to the people whatever, a convention shall come together in the state of New York, to make a new constitution. Is it strange, then, that this complex system of our government should be found to work after the lapse of seventy years a little roughly, and that it requires that the engineer should look into the various parts of the engine, and see where the gudgeon is worn out, and watch that the main wheel is kept in motion? A child can draw a pin from the mightiest engine, and arrest its motion, and the engineer cannot see it when it is being done, but if the engine be rightly devised, and strongly constructed, he has only to see where the pin has been withdrawn and replace it, and the engine will go on more strongly and more vigorously than ever. We are a family of thirty-three states, and next Monday I hope we are to be a family of thirty-four.

Would it not be strange if in a family of thirty-four members there should be, once in the course of a few years, one, or two, or three, or four, of the members of the family who would become discontented and wish to withdraw for a while to see how much better they can manage their own fortunes alone. I think nothing strange of that. I only wonder that nobody has ever withdrawn before, to see how much better they could get along on their own hooks, than to go along in this plain old-fashioned way under the direction of Uncle Sam. Massachusetts, and some of the New England states, they say, when I was a boy, got the same idea of contumacy toward the common parent and want of affection for the whole family, and

they got up the "Hartford Convention." I
that personal. Well, they say that someb
don't know who, tried it. All that I knc
twenty years of my political life, someho
responsible for the Hartford Convention.

I have made this singular discovery, th
chusetts, or any New England state, threaten
the democratic party all insist that it is hi
be punished by coercion, while, when one of
hold of the same idea, the same party think
is very doubtful whether they ought not t
Union, and be given a good dowry besides.
all the truths, that, whether it is Massachu
or whether it is New York or Louisiana, it
same way in every case—that there is no s
no such thing in reason—no such thing i
thing in nature, as any state existing on
America, long out of the United States of .
a word of it—I don't believe it for man
named, and for one, I don't see any other
The best reason I hear is, that the people
states hate us of the free states very badl
hate them, and that all love is lost betwe
word of that.

On the other hand, I do know for myself,
some differences of opinion about advantage
and about freedom and slavery, and all that
differences, concerning which we do not ta
part of the world into our counsel on eith
state outside of the American Union that I
the state of South Carolina—neither Englar
land, nor France, nor even Turkey, although
sent me some Arabian horses, while from S
me nothing but curses, still I like South Ca
them. I do not know but I have a presumpti
if there was anybody to overhear the state
she is talking to herself, that she would co
bly well; and I am very sure that if anybod
upon New York to-morrow—whether Louis

or his mother, or the emperor of Russia or Austria—if either of them were to make a descent upon the city of New York to-morrow, I believe all the hills of South Carolina would pour forth their population to the rescue of New York. God knows how this may be, or when the present excitement may end. I do not pretend to know, I only conjecture; but this I do know, that if any one of these powers were to make a descent upon Charleston and South Carolina, I know who would go to their rescue. We would all go. We all know that; everybody knows that: therefore they do not humbug me with their secession. I do not think they will humbug you, and I do not believe that if they do not humbug you or me, that they will succeed very long in humbugging themselves.

Now, this is the ultimate result of all this business. These states were always intended to remain together. They always shall. Talk of taking one star out of this glorious constellation! It is something which cannot be done. I do not see any fewer stars now than I did last winter; on the contrary, I expect to see more. The question then is, when at this time people are struggling under a delusion that they are getting out of the Union, and going to set up for themselves, what are we to do in order to hold them in? I do not know any better rule than the rule which every good New England man, I suppose, though I have not much acquaintance with New England —every father of a family in New York, who is a sensible man—I suppose New England fathers do the same thing—the rule which they practise. It is this—if a good man wishes to keep his family together it is the easiest thing in the world. When one gets discontented, begins to quarrel, to complain, does his father quarrel with him, tease him, threaten him, coerce him? No; that is just the way to get rid of a family.

But, on the other hand, if you wish to keep them together, you have only one thing to do—to be patient, kind, forbearing, and wait until they come to reflect for themselves. The south is to us what the wife is to the husband. I do not know a man in the world who cannot get rid of his wife if he tries to do so. I can put him in the way to do it at once. He has only two things to do—one is to be unfaithful to her, the other is to be out of temper with her, and she will be glad to leave him. That is the most simple way. I do not know a man on earth—I do not think but that even Socrates could have got rid of his wife if he desired to do so, in this way; but if

he wished to keep his wife, he must keep
also.

In all this business, I propose that we s
which in politics consists in remembering
brethren, even of the same family, must
entirely cool, and entirely calm, and e
ensue, which will be kind of itself, and it
that either we are wrong, and should make
brothers, or else that we are right, and th
back into fraternal relations with us.

I do not desire to anticipate any qu
many statesmen who assume to know a
poses to do; what the government prop
intend to coerce our southern brethren
Then they ask us, of course, as they ma
the value of a fraternity which is compu
on that subject is, that it was so long tim
Thomas More, when he made the discove
his writings, "that there are a great ma
few who know how to instruct children, a
how to whip them."

I propose to have no questions on that
plaints—redress them if we can, and exp
if they are unreasonable. I know that
ated this Union are stronger to-day than
was cemented, and that those necessities
sions of man are short-lived and evanesc

NOTE.—See speech in state senate January 10, 1834, V
March 11, 1850, Vol. I., pp. 81–89; address at Auburn July
ber, 1844, Vol. III., pp. 245 and 267; letter May, 1845, Vol. I

THE STATE OF THE UNION.[1]

CONGRESS adjourned last summer amid auspices of national abundance, contentment, tranquillity and happiness. It has reassembled this winter in the presence of derangement of business and disturbance of public as well as private credit, and in the face of seditious combinations to overthrow the Union. The alarm is appalling; for Union is not more the body than Liberty is the soul of the nation. The American citizen has been accustomed to believe the republic immortal. He shrinks from the sight of convulsions indicative of its sudden death. The report of our condition has gone over the seas, and we who have so long and with much complacency studied the endless agitations of society in the Old World, believing ourselves exempt from such disturbances, now, in our turn, seem to be falling into a momentous and disastrous revolution.

I know how difficult it is to decide, amid so many and so various counsels, what ought to be and even what can be done. Certainly, however, it is time for every senator to declare himself. I, therefore, following the example of the noble senator from Tennessee [Mr. JOHNSON], avow my adherence to the Union in its integrity and with all its parts, with my friends, with my party, with my state, with my country, or without either, as they may determine; in every event, whether of peace or of war; with every consequence of honor or dishonor, of life or death. Although I lament the occasion, I hail with cheerfulness the duty of lifting up my voice among distracted debates, for my whole country and its inestimable Union.

Hitherto the exhibitions of spirit and resolution here, as elsewhere, have been chiefly made on the side of disunion. I do not regret this. Disunion is so unnatural that it must plainly reveal itself before its presence can be realized. I like best, also, the courage that rises slowly under the pressure of severe provocation. If it be a Christian duty to forgive to the stranger even seventy times seven offenses, it

[1] Speech in the Senate of the United States, January 12, 1861.

is the highest patriotism to endure without complaint the passi
waywardness of political brethren so long as there is hope that
may come to a better mind.

I think it is easy to pronounce what measures or conduct wil
save the Union. I agree with the honorable senator from N
Carolina [Mr. CLINGMAN], that mere eulogiums will not save it.
I think that as prayer brings us nearer to God, though it ca
move Him toward us, so there is healing and saving virtue in e
word of devotion to the Union that is spoken, and in every sigh
its danger draws forth. I know, at least, that, like truth, it de
strength from every irreverent act that is committed, and every
phemous phrase that is uttered against it.

The Union cannot be saved by mutual criminations concerning
respective shares of responsibility for the present evils. He w
conscience acquits him will naturally be slow to accuse others w
coöperation he needs. History only can adjust that great accou

A continuance of the debate on the constitutional power of
gress over the subject of slavery in the territories, will not save
Union. The opinions of parties and sections on that question, l
become dogmatical, and it is this circumstance that has produced
existing alienation. A truce, at least during the debate on
Union, is essential to reconciliation.

The Union cannot be saved by proving that secession is illega
unconstitutional. Persons bent on that fearful step will not s
long enough on forms of law to be dislodged; and loyal men do
need such narrow ground to stand upon.

I fear that little more will be gained from discussing the righ
the federal government to coerce seceding states into obedience.
disunion is to go on, this question will give place to the more p
tical one, whether many seceding states have a right to coerce
remaining members to acquiesce in a dissolution.

I dread, as in my innermost soul I abhor, civil war. I do not k
what the Union would be worth if saved by the use of the sw
Yet for all this, I do not agree with those who, with a desire to a
that great calamity, advise a conventional or unopposed separat
with a view to what they call a reconstruction. It is enough for
first, that in this plan, destruction goes before reconstruction;
secondly, that the strength of the vase in which the hopes of
nation are held, consists chiefly in its remaining unbroken.

Congressional compromises are not likely to save the Union. I know, indeed, that tradition favors this form of remedy. But it is essential to its success, in any case, that there be found a preponderating mass of citizens, so far neutral on the issue which separates parties, that they can intervene, strike down clashing weapons, and compel an accommodation. Moderate concessions are not customarily asked by a force with its guns in battery; nor are liberal concessions apt to be given by an opposing force not less confident of its own right and its own strength. I think, also, that there is a prevailing conviction that legislative compromises which sacrifice honestly cherished principles, while they anticipate future exigencies, even if they do not assume extra-constitutional powers, are less sure to avert imminent evils than they are certain to produce ultimately even greater dangers.

Indeed, I think it will be wise to discard two prevalent ideas or prejudices, namely: first, that the Union is to be saved by somebody in particular; and secondly, that it is to be saved by some cunning and insincere compact of pacification. If I remember rightly, I said something like this here so long ago as 1850, and afterwards in 1854.

The present danger discloses itself in this form: Discontented citizens have obtained political power in certain states, and they are using this authority to overthrow the federal government. They delude themselves with a belief that the state power they have acquired enables them to discharge themselves of allegiance to the whole republic. The president says that no state has a right to secede, but we have no constitutional power to make war against a state. The dilemma results from an assumption that those who, in such a case, act against the federal government, act lawfully as a state; although manifestly they have perverted the power of the state to an unconstitutional purpose. A class of politicians in New England set up this theory and attempted to practise upon it in our war with Great Britain. Mr. Jefferson did not hesitate to say that states must be kept within their constitutional sphere by impulsion, if they could not be held there by attraction. Secession was then held to be inadmissible in the face of a public enemy. But if it is untenable in one case, it is necessarily so in all others. I fully admit the originality, the sovereignty and the independence of the several states within their sphere. But I hold the federal government to be equally

original, sovereign and independent within its sphere. An
government of the state can no more absolve the people re
within its limits from allegiance to the Union, than the gover
of the Union can absolve them from allegiance to the state.
constitution of the United States and the laws made in purs
thereof, are the supreme law of the land, paramount to all legis
of the states, whether made under the constitution, or by even
organic conventions. The Union can be dissolved, not by sece
without armed force, but only by the voluntary consent of the p
of the United States, collected in the manner prescribed by th
stitution of the United States.

Congress, in the present case, ought not to be impassiv
ought, if it can, to redress any real grievances of the offended s
and then it ought to supply the president with all the means
sary to maintain the Union in the full exhibition and discreet
cise of its authority. Beyond this, with the proper activity o
part of the executive, the responsibility of saving the Union be
to the people, and they are abundantly competent to discharge

I propose, therefore, with great deference, to address myself
the senate than to the country, upon the momentous subject, a
a hearing, not less from the people within what are called the sece
than from those who reside within the adhering states.

Union is an old, fixed, settled habit of the American p
resulting from convictions of its necessity, and therefore not
to be hastily discarded. The early states, while existing as col
were combined, though imperfectly, through a common allegia
the British crown. When that allegiance ceased, no one was s
sumptuous as to suppose political existence compatible with disu
and, therefore, on the same day that they declared themselves
pendent, they proclaimed themselves also confederated states.
rience in war and in peace, from 1776 until 1787, only conv
them of the necessity of converting that loose confederacy i
more perfect and a perpetual Union. They acted with a co
very different from the intemperate conduct of those who n
one side threaten, and those who on the other rashly defy dis
They considered the continuance of the Union as a subject co
hending nothing less than the safety and welfare of all the pa
which the country was composed, and the fate of an empire in
respects the most interesting in the world. I enter upon the s

of continuing the Union now, deeply impressed with the same generous and loyal conviction. How could it be otherwise, when, instead of only thirteen, the country is now composed of thirty-three parts; and the empire embraces, instead of only four millions, no less than thirty millions of inhabitants.[1]

The founders of the constitution, moreover, regarded the Union as no mere national or American interest. On the contrary, they confessed, with deep sensibility, that it seemed to them to have been reserved for the people of this country to decide whether societies of men are really capable of establishing good government upon reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force. They feared, therefore, that their failure to continue and perfect the Union would be a misfortune to the nations. How much more would its overthrow now be a calamity to mankind!

Some form of government is indispensable here as elsewhere. Whatever form we have, every individual citizen and every state must cede to it some natural rights, to invest the government with the requisite power. The simple question, therefore, for us now to decide, while laying aside all pique, passion and prejudice, is, whether it conduces more to the interests of the people of this country to remain, for the general purposes of peace and war, commerce, inland and foreign, postal communications at home and abroad, the care and disposition of the public domain, colonization, the organization and admission of new states, and, generally, the enlargement of empire, one nation under our present constitution, than it would be to divide themselves into separate confederacies or states.

Our country remains now as it was in 1787—composed, not of detached and distant territories, but of one whole well-connected and fertile region, lying within the temperate zone, with climates and soils hardly more various than those of France or of Italy. This slight diversity quickens and amplifies manufactures and commerce. Our rivers and valleys, as improved by art, furnish us a system of highways unequaled in the world. The different forms of labor, if slavery were not perverted to purposes of political ambition, need not constitute an element of strife in the confederacy.

Notwithstanding recent vehement expressions and manifestations

[1] The materials and even the form of this part of the argument are drawn from the opening numbers of the Federalist.

of intolerance in some quarters, produced l
ment, we are, in fact, a homogeneous peo
with accessions well assimilated. We ha
language, one religion, one system of gove
customs common to all. Why, then, shall
as hitherto, one people?

The first object of every human society
which, if need be, they will, and they m
This security is of two kinds: one, exemp
sion and influence; the other, exemptio
and sedition.

Foreign wars come from either violatio
disturbance. The Union has, thus far, pr
fect shield against such wars. The United
ing their diplomatic acquaintance, have
the Netherlands, Great Britain, Sweden,
Denmark, Mexico, Brazil, Austria, Turk
Venezuela, Peru, Greece, Sardinia, Ecua
New Grenada, Hesse Cassel, Wurtemburg,
Nassau, Switzerland, Mecklenburg-Schwer
ian Islands, San Salvador, Borneo, Costa
Argentine Confederation, Loo Choo, Ja
Baden, Belgium, and Paraguay. Neverth
within their entire existence under the
had flagrant wars with only four states, tw
cant powers on the coast of Barbary; and
amounting to reprisals, against only two
are now at peace with the whole world.
divided into only two confederacies, each
make as many treaties as we have now;
liable to give as many causes of war as we
from the sad experience of other nations
begun, inevitably continues until even the
into many parts. Each confederation that
of the ruin of the Union will have necessi
we now have, and will incur liabilities fo
do, by breaking them. It is the multipli
want of confederation, that makes war
society in western Europe and in Spanis

that, notwithstanding our world-wide intercourse, makes peace the habit of the American people.

I will not descend so low as to ask whether new confederacies would be able or willing to bear the grievous expense of maintaining the diplomatic relations which cannot be dispensed with except by withdrawing from foreign commerce. Our federal government is better able to avoid giving just causes of war than several confederacies, because it can conform the action of all the states to compacts. It can have but one construction, and only one tribunal to pronounce that construction, of every treaty. Local and temporary interests and passions, or personal cupidity and ambition, can drive small confederacies or states more easily than a great republic, into indiscreet violations of treaties.

The United States, being a great and formidable power, can always secure favorable and satisfactory treaties. Indeed, every treaty we have was voluntarily made. Small confederacies, or states, must take such treaties as they can get, and give whatever treaties are exacted. A humiliating, or even an unsatisfactory treaty, is a chronic cause of foreign war.

The chapter of wars resulting from unjustifiable causes would, in case of division, amplify itself in proportion to the number of new confederacies and their irritability. Our disputes with Great Britain about Oregon, the boundary of Maine, the patriot insurrection in Canada, and the island of San Juan; the border strifes between Texas and Mexico; the incursions of the late William Walker into Mexico and Central America; all these were cases in which war was prevented only by the imperturbability of the federal government.

This government not only gives fewer causes of war, whether just or unjust, than smaller confederacies would; but it always has a greater ability to accommodate them by the exercise of more coolness and courage, the use of more various and more liberal means, and the display, if need be, of greater force. Every one knows how placable we ourselves are in controversies with Great Britain, France, and Spain; and yet how exacting we have been in our intercourse with New Granada, Paraguay, and San Juan de Nicaragua.

No one will dispute our forefathers' maxim, that the common safety of all is the safety of each of the states. While they remain united the federal government combines all the materials and all

the forces of the several states; organizes
eral principle; harmonizes and assimila
watches for them with a single eye, whic
and moves all agents under the control
nation so constituted is safe against ass
produces always a speedy exhaustion of
upon credit. The treasuries and credits o
often prove inadequate. Those of the U

I have thus far kept out of view the
between the confederacies themselves.
inconsiderable nations bordering on e
according to all political philosophy, nat
to the many treaties which each must
and the causes of war which they woul
each of the confederacies must also ma
others, and so be liable to give them freq
necessarily have different interests resulti
of different policies of revenue, of minir
gation, of immigration, and perhaps the
stipulate with foreign nations for advan
injurious to its rivals.

If, indeed, it were necessary that the U
it would be in the last degree important
to be formed should be as nearly as po
power, that mutual fear and mutual r
with caution against mutual offense. B
long be maintained; one confederacy
political importance; and the others wo
with envy and apprehension. Jealousie
and retaliatory wars, and all these wars,
stances of the confederacies, would have
civil war. Dissolution, therefore, is, for
perpetual civil war. To mitigate it, and
could they accept but the system of adju
which has obtained in Europe, in which
tate the very terms on which all the oth
When this hateful system should fail at
intervene, now in favor of one and th
thus our country, after having expelled

the continent, would relapse into an aggravated form of its colonial experience, and, like Italy, Turkey, India, and China, become the theatre of transatlantic intervention and rapacity.

If, however, we grant to the new confederacies an exemption from complications among each other and with foreign states, still there is too much reason to believe that not one of them could long maintain a republican form of government. Universal suffrage and the absence of a standing army are essential to the republican system. The world has yet to see a single self-sustaining state of that kind, or even any confederation of such states, except our own. Canada leans on Great Britain not unwillingly, and Switzerland is guaranteed by interested monarchical states. Our own experiment has thus far been successful; because, by the continual addition of new states, the influence of each of the members of the Union is constantly restrained and reduced. No one, of course, can foretell the way and manner of travel; but history indicates with unerring certainty the end which the several confederacies would reach. Licentiousness would render life intolerable: and they would sooner or later purchase tranquillity and domestic safety by the surrender of liberty, and yield themselves up to the protection of military despotism.

Indulge me in one or two details under this head. First, it is only sixty days since this disunion movement began; already those who are engaged in it have canvassed with portentous freedom the possible recombinations of the states when dissevered, and the feasible alliances of those recombinations with European nations; alliances as unnatural, and which would prove ultimately as pestilential to society here as that of the Tlascalans with the Spaniard, who promised them revenge upon their ancient enemies, the Aztecs.

Secondly, The disunion movement arises partly out of a dispute over the common domain of the United States. Hitherto the Union has confined this controversy within the bounds of political debate by referring it, with all other national ones, to the arbitrament of the ballot-box. Does any suppose that disunion would transfer the whole domain to either party, or that any other umpire than war would, after dissolution, be invoked?

Thirdly, This movement arises, in another view, out of the relation of African slaves to the dynastic population of the country. Freedom is to them, as to all mankind, the chief object of desire.

Hitherto, under the operation of the Union, they have pract
remained ignorant of the controversy, especially of its bearir
themselves. Can we hope that flagrant civil war shall rage a
ourselves in their very presence, and yet that they will remain s
and idle spectators? Does history furnish us any satisfactory in
tion upon the horrors of civil war among a people so brave, so s
in arms, so earnest in conviction, and so intent in purpose as we
Is it a mere chimera which suggests an aggravation of those h
beyond endurance when, on either side, there shall occur the
vention of an uprising ferocious African slave population of
or six, perhaps twenty millions?

The opinions of mankind change, and with them the politi
nations. One hundred years ago all the commercial European
were engaged in transferring negro slaves from Africa to this
sphere. To-day all those states are firmly set in hostility t
extension and even to the practice of slavery. Opposition to it
two forms: one, European, which is simple, direct abolition, eff
if need be, by compulsion; the other, American, which see
arrest the African slave trade, and resist the entrance of dor
slavery into territories where it is yet unknown, while it leave
disposition of existing slavery to the considerate action of the
by which it is retained. It is the Union that restricts the oppo
to slavery in this country within these limits. If dissolution
vail, what guarantee shall there be against the full developmen
of the fearful and uncompromising hostility to slavery which
where pervades the world, and of which the recent invasio
Virginia was an illustration?

I have designedly dwelt so long on the probable effects o
union upon the safety of the American people as to leave me
time to consider the evils which must follow in its train.
practically, the loss of safety involves every other form of p
calamity. When once the guardian angel has taken flight, e
thing is lost.

Dissolution would not only arrest but extinguish the greatne
our country. Even if separate confederacies could exist and en
they could severally preserve no share of the common *prestige* o
Union. If the constellation is to be broken up, the stars, wh
scattered widely apart or grouped in smaller clusters, will th
forth shed only feeble, glimmering and lurid lights. Nor will

achievements be possible for the new confederacies. Dissolution would signalize its triumph by acts of wantonness which would shock and astound the world. It would provincialize Mount Vernon and give this capitol over to desolation at the very moment when the dome is rising over our heads that was to be crowned with the statue of Liberty. After this there would remain for disunion no act of stupendous infamy to be committed. No petty confederacy that shall follow the United States can prolong, or even renew, the majestic drama of national progress. Perhaps it is to be arrested because its sublimity is incapable of continuance. Let it be so, if we have indeed become degenerate. After Washington, and the inflexible Adams, Henry, and the peerless Hamilton, Jefferson, and the majestic Clay, Webster, and the acute Calhoun, Jackson, the modest Taylor, and Scott who rises in greatness under the burden of years, and Franklin, and Fulton, and Whitney, and Morse, have all performed their parts, let the curtain fall!

While listening to these debates, I have sometimes forgotten myself in marking their contrasted effects upon the page who customarily stands on the dais before me, and the venerable secretary who sits behind him. The youth exhibits intense but pleased emotion in the excitement, while at every irreverent word that is uttered against the Union the eyes of the aged man are suffused with tears. Let him weep no more. Rather rejoice, for yours has been a lot of rare felicity. You have seen and been a part of all the greatness of your country, the towering national greatness of all the world. Weep only you, and weep with all the bitterness of anguish, who are just stepping on the threshold of life; for that greatness perishes prematurely and exists not for you, nor for me, nor for any that shall come after us.

The public prosperity! How could it survive the storm? Its elements are industry in the culture of every fruit; mining of all the metals; commerce at home and on every sea; material improvement that knows no obstacle and has no end; invention that ranges throughout the domain of nature; increase of knowledge as broad as the human mind can explore; perfection of art as high as human genius can reach; and social refinement working for the renovation of the world. How could our successors prosecute these noble objects in the midst of brutalizing civil conflict? What guaranties will capital invested for such purposes have, that will outweigh the

premium offered by political and military ambition? What leis will the citizen have for study, or invention, or art, under the rei of conscription; nay, what interest in them will society feel, when f and hate shall have taken possession of the national mind? Let miner in California take heed; for its golden wealth will become prize of the nation that can command the most iron. Let the b derer take care; for the Indian will again lurk around his dwelli Let the pioneer come back into our denser settlements; for the r road, the post road and the telegraph advance not one furlong f ther into the wilderness. With standing armies consuming substance of our people on the land, and our navy and our pos steamers withdrawn from the ocean, who will protect or respect, who will even know by name, our petty confederacies? The Ame can man-of-war is a noble spectacle. I have seen it enter an ancie port in the Mediterranean. All the world wondered at it, and talk of it. Salvos of artillery, from forts and shipping in the harb saluted its flag. Princes and princesses and merchants paid homage, and all the people blessed it as a harbinger of hope f their own ultimate freedom. I imagine now the same noble v sel again entering the same haven. The flag of thirty-three st and thirteen stripes has been hauled down, and in its place a sig is run up which flaunts the device of a lone star or a palmetto tr Men ask, "Who is the stranger that thus steals into our waters The answer, contemptuously given, is, "She comes from one of t obscure republics of North America. Let her pass on."

Lastly, public liberty, our own peculiar liberty, must languish f a time, and then cease to live. And such a liberty! Free mov ment everywhere through our own land and throughout the worl free speech, free press, free suffrage; the freedom of every subje to vote on every law, and for or against every agent who expoun administers or executes it. Unstable and jealous confederacies, co stantly apprehending assaults without and treason within, formid ble only to each other and contemptible to all beside; how long w it be before, on the plea of public safety, they will surrender all th inestimable and unequaled liberty, and accept the hateful and into rable espionage of military despotism?

And now, what is the cause for this sudden and eternal sacrifi of so much safety, greatness, happiness and freedom? Have forei nations combined, and are they coming in rage upon us? No.

far from being enemies, there is not a nation on earth that is not an interested admiring friend. Even the London Times, by no means partial to us, says:

"It is quite possible that the problem of a democratic republic may be solved by its overthrow in a few days, in a spirit of folly, selfishness, and short-sightedness.

Has the federal government become tyrannical or oppressive, or even rigorous or unsocial? Has the constitution lost its spirit, and all at once collapsed into a lifeless letter? No; the federal government smiles more benignantly, and works to-day more beneficently, than ever. The constitution is even the chosen model for the organization of the newly rising confederacies.

The occasion is the election of a president of the United States, who is unacceptable to a portion of the people. I state the case accurately. There was no movement of disunion before the ballots which expressed that choice were cast. Disunion began as soon as the result was announced. The justification it assigned was, that Abraham Lincoln had been elected, while the success of either one of three other candidates would have been acquiesced in. Was the election illegal? No; it is unimpeached. Is the candidate personally offensive? No; he is a man of unblemished virtue and amiable manners. Is an election of president an unfrequent or extraordinary transaction? No; we never had a chief magistrate otherwise designated than by such election, and that form of choice is renewed every four years. Does any one even propose to change the mode of appointing the chief magistrate? No; election by universal suffrage, as modified by the constitution, is the one crowning franchise of the American people. To save it they would defy the world. Is it apprehended that the new president will usurp despotic powers? No; while he is of all men the most unambitious, he is, by the partial success of those who opposed his election, subjected to such restraints that he cannot, without their consent, appoint a minister, or even a police agent, negotiate a treaty, or procure the passage of a law, and can hardly draw a musket from the public arsenals to defend his own person.

What, then, is the ground of discontent? It is that the disunionists did not accept as conclusive the arguments which were urged in behalf of the successful candidate in the canvass. This is all. Were their own arguments against him more satisfactory to his supporters?

Of course they were not; they could not be. Does the constitutio in letter or spirit, require or imply that the arguments of one par shall be satisfactory to the other? No; that is impossible. Wh is the constitutional remedy for this inevitable dissatisfaction? R newed debate and ultimate rehearing in a subsequent election. Ha the now successful majority perverted power to purposes of oppre sion? No; they have never before held power. Alas! how pro we are to undervalue privileges and blessings. How gladly, ho proudly, would the people of any nation in Europe accept, on su terms as we enjoy it, the boon of electing a chief magistrate eve four years by free, equal and universal suffrage! How thankful would they cast aside all their own systems of government, a accept this republic of ours, with all its short-comings and its di appointments, maintain it with their arms, and cherish it in the hearts. Is it not the very boon for which they supplicate God wit out ceasing, and even wage war, with intermissions only resulti from exhaustion? How strange are the times in which we liv The coming spring season on one side of the Atlantic will open a general conflict, waged to obtain, through whatever indirectio just such a system as ours; and on this side of the Atlantic, with the same parallels of latitude, it will open on fraternal war, wag in a moment of frenzied discontent to overthrow and annihilate t same institutions. Do men, indeed, live only for themselves, revenge their own wrongs, or to gratify their own ambition? Rath do not men live least of all for themselves, and chiefly for posteri and for their fellow-men! Have the American people, then, becom all of a sudden unnatural, as well as unpatriotic? and will they di inherit their children of the precious estate held only in trust f them, and deprive the world of the best hopes it has enjoyed sin the human race began its slow and painful, yet needful and wise appointed progress?

Here I might close my plea for the American Union; but it necessary, if not to exhaust the argument, at least to exhibit t whole case. The disunionists, consciously unable to stand on the mere disappointment in the recent election, have attempted to enlar their ground. More than thirty years there has existed a conside able—though not heretofore a formidable—mass of citizens in certai states, situate near or around the delta of the Mississippi, wh believe that the Union is less conducive to the welfare and greatne

of those states than a smaller confederacy, embracing only slave states, would be. This class has availed itself of the discontents resulting from the election to put into operation the machinery of dissolution, long ago prepared and waiting only for occasion. In other states there is a soreness because of the want of sympathy in the free states with the efforts of slaveholders for the recapture of fugitives from service. In all the slave states there is a restlessness resulting from the resistance which has been so determinedly made, within the last few years, in the free states, to the extension of slavery in the common territories of the United States. The republican party, which cast its votes for the successful presidential candidate, on the ground of that policy, has been allowed, practically, no representation, no utterance by speech or through the press, in the slave states; while its policy, principles, and sentiments, and even its temper, have been so misrepresented as to excite apprehensions that it denies important constitutional obligations, and aims even at interference with slavery and its overthrow by state authorities or intervention of the federal government. Considerable masses even in the free states, interested in the success of these misrepresentations as a means of partisan strategy, have lent their sympathy to the party claiming to be aggrieved. While the result of the election brings the republican party necessarily into the foreground in resisting disunion, the prejudices against them, which I have described, have deprived them of the coöperation of many good and patriotic citizens. On a complex issue between the republican party and the disunionists, although it involves the direst national calamities, the result might be doubtful; for the republican party is weak in a large part of the Union. But on a direct issue, with all who cherish the Union on one side, and all who desire its dissolution by force on the other, the verdict would be prompt and almost unanimous. I desire thus to simplify the issue, and for that purpose to separate from it all collateral questions, and relieve it of all partisan passions and prejudices.

I consider the idea of the withdrawal of the gulf states, and their permanent reörganization with or without others in a distinct confederacy, as a means of advantage to themselves, so certainly unwise and so obviously impossible of execution, when the purpose is understood, that I dismiss it with the discussion I have already incidentally bestowed upon it.

The case is different, however, in rega
which I have brought in this connection b
a doubt, Union is vitally important to the
United States; but it is just as important to
licanism and Union are, therefore, not cor
canism is subordinate to the Union, as eve
to be—republicanism, democracy, every
thing; all are subordinate—and they ou
presence of the great question of Union.
it shall be so; it should be so if the quest
as it ought only to be determined, by th
ballot. It shall be so all the more since
paredness to refer to it the arbitrament o
faith in this republican system of ours, that
which I desire that I am not content to
forms of administration without invoking
others shall invoke that form of action
government, they shall not, so far as it
excuse that I obstinately left myself to be
a case I can afford to meet prejudice wi
with concession which surrenders no princi
right hand of peace. Therefore, so far
whether, by the constitution of the Unit
who is made such by the laws of a state
property, I answer that, within that state
are supreme; that when he has escaped fro
the constitution regards him as a bondsm
law or regulation of that state, be dischar
shall be delivered up, on claim, to the part
due. While prudence and justice would c
to modify the acts of congress on that su
private persons to assist in their executio
from being, by abuse of the laws, carried
all laws of the states, whether free states or
to this class of persons, or any others rece
dent in other states, and which laws cont
the United States, or any law of congr
thereto, ought to be repealed.

Secondly: Experience in public affairs has confirmed my opinion, that domestic slavery, existing in any state, is wisely left by the constitution of the United States exclusively to the care, management, and disposition of that state; and if it were in my power, I would not alter the constitution in that respect. If misapprehension of my position needs so strong a remedy, I am willing to vote for an amendment of the constitution, declaring that it shall not, by any future amendment, be so altered as to confer on congress a power to abolish or interfere with slavery in any state.

Thirdly: While I think that congress has exclusive and sovereign authority to legislate on all subjects whatever, in the common territories of the United States, and while I certainly shall never, directly or indirectly, give my vote to establish or sanction slavery in such territories, or anywhere else in the world, yet the question what constitutional laws shall at any time be passed in regard to the territories, is, like every other question, to be determinined on practical grounds. I voted for enabling acts in the cases of Oregon, Minnesota and Kansas, without being able to secure in them such provisions as I would have preferred; and yet I voted wisely. So, now, I am well satisfied that, under existing circumstances, a happy and satisfactory solution of the difficulties in the remaining territories would be obtained by similar laws, providing for their organization, if such organization were otherwise practicable. If, therefore, Kansas were admitted as a state under the Wyandotte constitution, as I think she ought to be, and if the organic laws of all the other territories could be repealed, I could vote to authorize the organization and admission of two new states which should include them, reserving the right to effect subdivisions of them, whenever necessary, into several convenient states; but I do not find that such reservations could be constitutionally made. Without them, the ulterior embarrassments which would result from the hasty incorporation of states of such vast extent and various interests and character, would outweigh all the immediate advantages of such a measure. But if the measure were practicable, I should prefer a different course, namely: when the eccentric movements of secession and disunion shall have ended, in whatever form that end may come, and the angry excitement of the hour shall have subsided, and calmness once more shall have resumed its accustomed sway over the public mind, then, and not until then—one, two or three years hence—I should cheerfully advise

a convention of the people, to be assembled in pursuance of the c
stitution, to consider and decide whether any and what amendme
of the organic national law ought to be made. A republican now
as I have heretofore been a member of other parties existing in
day—I nevertheless hold and cherish, as I have always done,
principle that this government exists in its present form only by
consent of the governed, and that it is as necessary as it is wise,
resort to the people for revisions of the organic law whenever
troubles and dangers of the state certainly transcend the pow
delegated by it to the public authorities. Nor ought the suggestio
excite surprise. Government in any form is a machine; this is
most complex one that the mind of man has ever invented, or
hand of man has ever framed. Perfect as it is, it ought to
expected that it will, at least as often as once in a century, req
some modification to adapt it to the changes of society and alter
tions of empire.

Fourthly: I hold myself ready now, as always heretofore, to v
for any properly guarded laws which shall be deemed necessary
prevent mutual invasions of states by citizens of other states, a
punish those who shall aid and abet them.

Fifthly: Notwithstanding the arguments of the gallant sena
from Oregon [General LANE], I remain of the opinion that physi
bonds, such as highways, railroads, rivers and canals, are vastly m
powerful for holding civil communities together than any mere co
nants, though written on parchment or engraved upon iron. I rem
therefore, constant to my purpose to secure, if possible, the constr
tion of two Pacific railways, one of which shall connect the po
around the mouths of the Mississippi, and the other the towns
the Missouri and the lakes, with the harbors on our western coast

If, in the expression of these views, I have not proposed wha
desired or expected by many others, they will do me the justice
believe that I am as far from having suggested what, in many respe
would have been in harmony with cherished convictions of my ow
I learned early from Jefferson that, in political affairs, we can
always do what seems to us absolutely best. Those with whom
must necessarily act, entertaining different views, have the power a
the right of carrying them into practice. We must be content
lead when we can, and to follow when we cannot lead; and if
cannot, at any time, do for our country all the good that we wo

wish, we must be satisfied with doing for her all the good that we can.

Having submitted my own opinions on this great crisis, it remains only to say, that I shall cheerfully lend to the government my best support in whatever prudent yet energetic efforts it shall make to preserve the public peace, and to maintain and preserve the Union; advising, only, that it practise, as far as possible, the utmost moderation, forbearance and conciliation.

And now what are the auspices of the country? I know that we are in the midst of alarms, and somewhat exposed to accidents unavoidable in seasons of tempestuous passions. We already have disorder, and violence has begun. I know not to what extent it may go. Still my faith in the constitution and in the Union abides, because my faith in the wisdom and virtue of the American people remains unshaken. Coolness, calmness and resolution are elements of their character. These have been temporarily displaced, but they are reäppearing. Soon enough, I trust, for safety, it will be seen that sedition and violence are only local and temporary, and that loyalty and affection to the Union are the natural sentiments of the whole country. Whatever dangers there shall be, there will be the determination to meet them; whatever sacrifices, private or public, shall be needful for the Union, they will be made. I feel sure that the hour has not come for this great nation to fall. This people, which has been studying to become wiser and better as it has grown older, is not yet perverse or wicked enough to deserve so dreadful and severe a punishment as dissolution. This Union has not yet accomplished what good for mankind was manifestly designed by Him who appoints the seasons and prescribes the duties of states and empires. No; if it were cast down by faction to-day, it would rise again and reappear in all its majestic proportions to-morrow. It is the only government that can stand here. Woe! woe! to the man that madly lifts his hand against it. It shall continue and endure; and men, in after times, shall declare that this generation, which saved the Union from such sudden and unlooked-for dangers, surpassed in magnanimity even that one which laid its foundations in the eternal principles of liberty, justice and humanity.

THE STATE OF THE UNION.[1]

I HAVE received a communication from a committee of tw five citizens of New York, who are charged with the dut presenting to the senate of the United States the petition c inhabitants of that city, praying for the exercise of the best wi of congress in finding some plan for the adjustment of the tro which disturb the peace and happiness and endanger the safe the nation.

Excepting the house of representatives, this senate chamber i largest hall that is, or ever has been, occupied by a legislative a bly since the world began. The memorial which I am charg present is of such a length that, if extended, it would cross the ate chamber, in its extremest length, eighteen times. I have al presented memorials from the city of New York signed by cit of that place to the number of twenty-five thousand. This m rial bears the signatures of thirty-eight thousand more, makir the whole, sixty-three thousand of the inhabitants of that city have signed this appeal to the senate. The committee who charge of this memorial are a fair representation—I might al say an embodiment—of the citizens who direct and wield the merce of the great emporium of our country, the commerce continent, and a commerce which this present year, owing to th tractions of the times, is put, for the first time, in the conditio proving itself to be the controlling commerce of the world. memorial which they present may be regarded as a fair expre of the interest which is felt by that great commercial commu and probably a fair exponent of the interest in the same great ject which is felt by the whole commercial interest of the U States. In any other part of the world, such a communic would command obedience. In England, France, Russia, Pr or Germany, a demonstration of the will of the commerce o

[1] Speech in the Senate on presenting the New York Union petition, January 30, 1861

country decides the questions of war or of peace. Happily, that is not the case in this great republic. The interest of commerce is but one. The interest of agriculture, manufactures, and mining, each of them, is another. Each is entitled to, and each secures, equal respect; and the consideration which they obtain is due, not to their number, not to their wealth, but is due to the circumstances under which they lend their advice to the government. But I do not hesitate to say that the character of these petitioners entitle them to the respectful attention and consideration of congress.

They have asked me to support this petition. I have not yet found, though I have anxiously waited and hoped for, that manifestation of temper on the part of the people of the country and their representatives which would justify me in saying that the seceding states, or those who sympathize with them, have made propositions which the citizens of the adhering states could accept; or, as I desire to speak with impartiality upon this as upon all other occasions, to put the proposition in another form, that this or any other of the various propositions which have come from citizens of the adhering states, or those who desire to adhere to the Union, would be acceptable and satisfactory to the other party. I have thought it my duty to hold myself open and ready for the best adjustment which could be practically made; and I have therefore been obliged to ask this committee to be content with the assurance that I would express to the public and to the senate that the spirit in which they come is perfectly commendable and perfectly satisfactory. It is gratifying to me to see that the proper spirit, the spirit of fraternal kindness, of conciliation and affection, is adopted by so large a portion of my fellow citizens of the state to which I belong.

I have asked them, also, in return for performing my duty on this occasion, that when they have arrived at home, they will act in the same spirit and manifest their devotion to the Union above all other interests and all other sentiments, by speaking for the Union, by voting for the Union, and if it should be demanded by lending and even giving their money for the Union, and fighting in the last resort for the Union; taking care always that speaking goes before voting. voting goes before giving money, and all go before a battle, which I should regard as hazardous and dangerous, and therefore the last, as it would be the most painful measure to be resorted to for the salvation of the Union.

This is the spirit in which I have determined for myself to
up to this great question, and to pass through it, as I sinc
believe we shall pass through it. For, although this great co
versy has not been already settled, I do not, therefore, any the
calculate upon and hope and expect that it will be peacefully se
and settled for the Union. I have not been so rash as to expect
in sixty days, which have been allowed to us since the meetin
congress—and I will be frank in saying that I have not exp
that in the ninety days which are the allotted term of congress—
great controversy would certainly be adjusted, peace restored,
the Union firmly reëstablished. I knew that sixty days, or n
days, was the term that was fixed with definite objects and pur
by that portion of my fellow citizens who have thought that it w
advance the interests of the states to which they belonged to dis
the Union. I have not expected that reason and judgment w
come back to the people and become so pervading, so univers
that they would appreciate the danger and be able to agree o
remedies. Still, I have been willing that it should be tried, th
unsuccessfully; but my confidence has remained the same, for
simple reason: that as I have not believed that the passion
frenzy of the hour could overturn this great fabric of constitut
liberty and empire in ninety days, so I have felt sure that
would be time, even after the expiration of ninety days, fo
restoration of all that had been lost, and for the reëstablishme
all that was in danger.

A great many and very various interests and elements are bro
into conflict in this sudden crisis; a great many personal ambiti
a great many sectional interests; and it would be strange if
could all be accommodated and arranged and harmonized, so
admit and give full effect to the one profoundest, strongest, and
enduring sentiment or passion of the United States—that of dev
to the Union. These, whether you call them secession or revol
on the one side, or coercion or defiance on the other, are all to
side and pass away before the Union is to become the grand al
ing object of interest, affection and duty, upon the part of the
zens of the United States. A great many partisan interests a
be repressed, suppressed, and to give place—partisan inte
expressed by the Charleston platform, by the Baltimore plat
by the Chicago platform, and by the popular sovereignty plat

—if indeed the Union is in danger and is to be saved; and with these interests, and with these platforms, everybody standing upon them or connected with them, is to pass away, if the Union is in danger and is to be saved, before the Union can be saved. But it will require a very short time, if this Union is in danger and does require to be saved, for all these interests and all these platforms and all these men to disappear. You and I, and every one who shall oppose, resist, stand in the way of the preservation of this Union, will appear but as moths on a summer evening, when the whirlwind of popular indignation arises that shall be excited at the full discovery that this Union is endangered through faction, or even impracticability on our part.

I have hope, confidence, that all this is to come around just as I have said, and quite soon enough; because I perceive, although we may shut our eyes to it, that the country and mankind cannot shut their eyes to the true nature of this crisis. There has been a real, a vital question in this country for twelve years at least—a question of slavery in the territories of the United States. It was strongest in its development in 1850, when all the Pacific coast, and all the territory intervening between it and the Louisiana purchase, were thrown upon our hands all of a sudden, for the purpose of our organizing in them free and independent republican governments, as a basis of future states. It has been an earnest, and I regret to say, an angry controversy; but the admission of Kansas into the Union yesterday settled at least all that was vital or important in the question, leaving behind nothing but the passions which the contest had engendered. Kansas is in the Union; California and Oregon are in the Union; and now the same contest divides and distracts this Union for freedom and slavery in the territories of the United States, just as before.

What is the extent of the territories which remain after the admission of Minnesota, of Oregon, of California, and of Kansas? One million sixty-three thousand five hundred and seven square miles, an area twenty-four times that of the state of New York, the largest of the old and fully developed states. Twenty-four such states as this of New York are yet to be organized within the remaining territories of the United States. Now, under what is accepted by the administration of the government as a judicial decree, upheld by it, put in practical operation by it, every inch of that territory is slave

territory—I speak of that decision not as I accept it, but as it is accepted and enforced by the existing administration—every foot of it slave territory as much as South Carolina. Over a considerable portion of it a slave code, made by a government created by the congress of the United States, is enforced; so that, according to the claims of those who insist upon a right in the territory of the United States for slavery, the whole of this one million sixty-three thousand square miles is slave territory. How many slaves are there in it? How many have been brought into it during these twelve years in which it has been not only relinquished to slavery, but in which the court and the legislature and the administration have maintained, protected, defended, and guaranteed slavery there? Twenty-four African slaves; one slave for every forty-four thousand square miles; one slave for every one of the twenty-four states which, supposing them each to be of the dimensions of New York or Pennsylvania or Indiana, are to cover that portion of the area of our republic. I have followed this thing in good faith, with zeal and energy; but I confess that I have no fears of slavery now, where, in the peculiar condition of things which has existed, slavery has succeeded in planting only one slave upon every forty-four thousand square miles of territory.

This, then, has ceased to be a practical question. In lieu of it comes up a great and vital and fearful question—the question of Union or dissolution of the Union; the question of country or of no country; the question of hope, the question of greatness, or the question of sinking forever under the contempt of mankind. Why then, should I despair that a great people of thirty millions will be able to meet this crisis? I have no fear. This is a confederacy. It is not an imperial government, nor the government of a single state; it is a confederacy; and it is, as it ought to be, dependent upon the continued assent of all the members of the confederacy to its existence, and subject to dissolution by their action; but that assent is to be always taken by virtue of the original assent and held, until, in the form prescribed by the constitution itself, and in the time and in the manner and with all the conditions which the constitution prescribes, those who constitute the Union shall declare that it shall be no longer. The thirty days, and sixty days, and ninety days, given us by the disunionists may not be enough for their policy and their purposes. I hope and trust that it may be

time enough for the policy and purposes of the lovers of the Union. God grant that it may be so! But if this term shall turn out not to be enough, then I see how and when all these great controversies will be settled, just as our forefathers foresaw when they framed the constitution. They provided, seventy years ago, that this present controversy, this whole controversy, shall be submitted to the people of the United States in convention, called according to the forms of the constitution, and acting in the manner prescribed by it. Then this country will find sudden relief in the prompt and unanimous adoption of the measures necessary for its salvation; and the world will see how well and how wisely a great, enlightened, educated, Christian people, consisting of thirty-four sovereign states, can adjust difficulties which had seemed, even to themselves, as well as to mankind, to be insurmountable.

Mr. MASON (after other remarks) said: I can understand, Mr. President, what the senator means when he recommends to his constituents to speak for the Union; we have had a great deal of that; I can understand what he means when he recommends them to vote for the Union, because he coupled it with a recommendation that they should go into state convention; but I demand to know what he means by their contributing money for the Union.

I will explain to the honorable senator, if he wishes. During the present session of congress, the government of this Union has seen a sudden depreciation of its credit. From one condition of things which existed a year or two ago, when all the stocks of the Union were at a premium, they have fallen until recently, at one time, the credit of the Union was at a discount of thirty per cent, while the credit of the state of New York, on her six per cent stock, all the while commands a premium. The commercial community, who to-day petition congress, have the treasure of the commercial city in their keeping. I have recommended to these gentlemen here, publicly, as I have heretofore recommended to them privately, that they should advance to the Union money on loans and on treasury notes, as they are now furnishing in that way to the Union the funds with which the president of the United States, the departments, the congress, the courts, yourself and myself, the senator from Virginia, the army, navy, and every branch of the government, is actually sustained, I have recommended to them, in this crisis, that they sustain the government of their country with the credit to which it is entitled at their hands.

I contemplated, after the expiration of all the multitudinous t they are making to save this Union by compromise, a conven of the people of the United States, called in constitutional fo and when that shall have been held, or refused to be held, and fo to be impossible to obtain; if, then, this Union is to stand or fal the force of arms, I have advised my people to do, as I shall be re to do myself, stand in the breach, and stand with it or perish wit

Mr. Mason.—Then we have it definite. I want to bring the honorable se the exponent of the new administration, to the policy which is to be adopte understand from him now, that remedies failing through the constitution b conventions of the states, his recommendation is battle and bloodshed to pre the Union; and his recommendation to his people is, that they shall contri the money which shall march the army upon the south; for what? To pre the Union?

I look to no such contingency as seceded states and a disseve Union. I look to no such condition of things. The honor senator and I differ in regard to the future. He, with an ear will and ardent imagination, sees this country hereafter rent and severed, and then recombined into separate confederacies. I se such thing in the future; but I do see, through the return of rea and judgment to the American people, a return of public harmo and the consolidation of the Union firmer than ever before. honorable senator from Virginia can very easily see that we r differ in our anticipations and expectations of the future, because differ so much in regard to the actual, living present. Here I am the Union of the United States, this same blessed, glorious, no inherited, God-given Union, in the senate chamber of the Un States, pleading for it, maintaining it, and defending it.

The honorable senator from Virginia says it is gone, there is Union; and yet he is here on this same floor with me. Where, th is he? In the Union, or out of the Union? He is actually pre here; and in spite of himself I hold him to be still with myself this glorious old Union. I will not strain the remark, which he me to put forth with candor and frankness. I therefore assume that infers because some other senators were here a short time ago, associates and mine, and are not here now, but have withdrawn, un circumstances known to the world, and which, for obvious reason refrain from commenting on, therefore their states are gone and Union is gone with them. The senate chamber is here; the st

are here; the Union is here still. Here they will all be; and I expect that, in the exercise of public reason, the free choice of these states, these places will all be filled. If I contemplate in any case that it may be necessary to fight for this Union, it is because treason and sedition may arise, not alone or only in a state of the south, but in states of the north, anywhere and everywhere, be excited and armed, so as to assail the Union; and whenever it shall come to that, whether it is in my own state or in any other state of the Union, then I expect that, whatever can be done having been done—as I have already indicated that all shall be done which reason can do—then I expect that what is right to be done shall be done in the way in which treason in the last resort is necessarily as well as lawfully met

Mr. MASON.—Mr. President, giving the honorable senator the full advantage of his present commentary upon the speech that preceded it, I yet place before the American people the fact that he proposes but one remedy, either to preserve this Union or to restore it, and that is the *ultima ratio regum*.

Mr. SEWARD.—Not to restore—preserve.

Mr. MASON.—I will take his own language. Let the facts be what they may, he presents but one remedy—the argument of the tyrant—force, compulsion, power. This is the only resort that the honorable senator has evinced, either in his speech or in his commentary. He says he is for punishing sedition and treason, whether it is found in the south or in the north.

I have been surprised at the delusion which the honorable senator from Virginia has been able to practise upon himself, so as to make out of a speech, peaceful, fraternal, cordial, such as I have made, a declaration of war. I cannot account for it, how it is that, while his sense of honor remains clear and bright—as I confess with pleasure it does—he avoids by design personalities which might irritate, yet his judgment is, somehow or other, so under the influence of his passion that he can see nothing but war in a speech which proposes simply this: that since this Union is in danger, every other question should be subordinate to the consideration and the removal of that danger by the pacific, constitutional action of the American people; by speech first, by vote, by consultation, by supplying and maintaining the credit of the government, and, in the last alternative, after having exhausted all the existing means of settlement, and all others that might be suggested; and finally, after a constitutional convention of the United States, called in the forms of the constitution—then, to stand by this good old flag, and, if it is to fall from its eminence, be wrapped in its folds.

That honorable senator could have recollected that I came i the committee of thirteen; that I listened to every proposition t was made; that I gave it deliberate—will any one say it was fraternal?—consideration. Will any one say that I offered up prejudices, no concessions, to propitiate an arrangement? Wh one of all the propositions that have been made have I refused consider? None. When I have voted to substitute a constitutic provision for the settlement of this question, such as that which offered by the honorable senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CLAI in preference to the proposition which requires us to take, in unconstitutional and ineffectual way, the sentiments of the pe on the proposition of the honorable senator from Kentucky, di do it in a spirit otherwise than that which belongs to a represe tive of the people who seek concessions? In regard to this v proceeding of the honorable senator's state which he so proudly c mends, and in terms to which I respond, have I not recommen to my own state, and is it not acting, in sending commissioner meet the other states in that convention? Does not the honor senator know that the state of New York stands ready to hear consider every plan, whether within the forms of the const tion or without them, to settle this question peacefully and with resort to the sword, and that I am with the state of New York that action? It is simply because I have learned from the inte in which—the honorable senator will excuse me for saying—I un stood him to speak, that neither any suggestion that has been m yet and considered, nor any that that convention can make and c sider and submit, or any other that has yet been projected, will satisfactory to that interest of secession or disunion in which inte he speaks. I then have submitted alone that further one: that w all these have failed, then the states of this Union, according to forms of the constitution, and in the spirit in which it was m shall take up this controversy about twenty-four negro slaves s tered over a territory of one million fifty thousand square mi and say whether, with the honorable senator from Virginia, they willing to sacrifice all this liberty, all this greatness, all this ha ness, and all this hope, because they have not intelligence, wisd and virtue enough to adjust a controversy so frivolous and c temptible.

APPENDIX.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.[1]

CHICAGO, MAY, 1860.

Resolved. That we, the delegated representatives of the republican electors of the United States, in convention assembled, in discharge of the duty we owe to our constituents and our country, unite in the following declarations:

FIRST. That the history of the nation during the last four years has fully established the propriety and necessity of the organization and perpetuation of the republican party, and that the causes which called it into existence are permanent in their nature, and now more than ever before demand its peaceful and constitutional triumph.

SECOND. That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the declaration of independence and embodied in the federal constitution, "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the federal constitution, the rights of the states, and the Union of the states, must and shall be preserved.

THIRD. That to the Union of the states this nation owes its unprecedented increase in population; its surprising development of material resources; its rapid augmentation of wealth; its happiness at home and its honor abroad; and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for disunion, come from whatever source they may; and we congratulate the country that no republican member of congress has uttered or countenanced the threats of disunion, so often made by democratic members, without rebuke and with applause from their political associates; and we denounce those threats of disunion, in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendency, as denying the vital principles of a free government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason, which it is the imperative duty of an indignant people sternly to rebuke and forever silence.

FOURTH. That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the states, and especially the right of each state, to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any state or territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

FIFTH. That the present democratic administration has far exceeded our worst apprehension in its measureless subserviency to the exactions of a sectional interest, as is especially evident in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Lecompton constitution upon the protesting people of Kansas—in construing the personal relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons—in its attempted enforcement everywhere, on land and sea, through the intervention of congress and of the federal courts, of the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest, and in its general and unvarying abuse of the power entrusted to it by a confiding people.

SIXTH. That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the federal government; that a return to rigid

[1] See *ante*, page 76.

economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plund the public treasury by favored partisans; while the recent startling developn of frauds and corruptions at the federal metropolis, show that an entire chang administration is imperatively demanded.

SEVENTH. That the new dogma that the constitution of its own force ca slavery into any or all of the territories of the United States, is a dangerous pol heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, cotemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent, is re tionary in its tendency and subversive of the peace and harmony of the coun

EIGHTH. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United Stat that of freedom; that as our republican fathers, when they had abolished sla in all our national territory, ordained that no "person should be deprived o liberty or property, without due process of law," it becomes our duty, by legisla whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the con tion against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of congres a territorial legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slave any territory of the United States.

NINTH. That we brand the recent reöpening of the African slave trade, u the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a c against humanity, and a burning shame to our country and age, and we call congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppre of that execrable traffic.

TENTH. That in the recent vetoes by the federal governors of the acts o legislatures of Kansas and Nebraska, prohibiting slavery in those territories find a practical illustration of the boasted democratic principle of non-interve and popular sovereignty, embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and a demon tion of the deception and fraud involved therein.

ELEVENTH. That Kansas should of right be immediately admitted as a s under the constitution recently formed and adopted by her people, and acce by the house of representatives.

TWELFTH. That while providing revenue for the support of the general gov ment by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of t imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the w country, and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to nation commercial prosperity and independence.

THIRTEENTH. That we protest against any sale or alienation to others of the p lands held by actual settlers, and against any view of the free homestead p which regards the settlers as paupers or suppliants for public bounty, and demand the passage by congress of the complete and satisfactory homestead m sure which has already passed the house.

FOURTEENTH. That the republican party is opposed to any change in our natu zation laws, or any state legislation by which the rights of citizenship hith accorded by emigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; an favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citi whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad.

FIFTEENTH. That appropriation by congress for river and harbor improvemen a national character, required for the accommodation and security of an exi commerce, are authorized by the constitution and justified by the obligatio government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

SIXTEENTH. That a railroad to the Pacific ocean is imperatively demande the interests of the whole country; that the federal government ought to re immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and that, as preliminary there daily overland mail should be promptly established.

SEVENTEENTH. Finally, having thus set forth our distinctive principles and vi we invite the coöperation of all citizens, however differing on other quest who substantially agree with us in their affirmance and support.

SPEECHES AT THE CHICAGO CONVENTION.[1]

WM. M. EVARTS, Chairman of the New York Delegation:

The state of New York, by a full delegation, with complete unanimity of purpose at home, came to this convention and presented to its choice one of its citizens, who had served the state from boyhood up, who had labored for and loved it. We came from a great state, with, as we thought, a great statesman, and our love of the great republic, from which we are all delegates, the great American Union, and our love of the great republican party of the Union, and our love of our statesman and candidate, made us think that we did our duty to the country, and the whole country, in expressing our love and preference for him. For, it was from Gov. Seward that most of us learned to love republican principles and the republican party. His fidelity to the country, the constitution and the laws; his fidelity to the party and the principle that the majority govern; his interest in the advancement of our party to its victory, that our country may rise to its true glory, induces me to assume to speak his sentiments, as I do, indeed, the opinions of our whole delegation when I move you, as I do now, that the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, as the republican candidate for the suffrages of the whole country for the office of chief magistrate of the American Union, be made unanimous.

JOHN A. ANDREW, Chairman of the Massachusetts Delegation:

I am deputed by the united voice of the Massachusetts delegation to second the motion just proposed by the distinguished citizen of New York, who represents the delegation of that noble state. I second that motion, therefore, in the name of Massachusetts, that the nomination of Abraham Lincoln be made unanimous. Gentlemen, the people of Massachusetts hold in their heart of hearts, next to their reverence and love for Christian faith, their reverence and love for the doctrine of equal and impartial liberty. We are republicans, more than a hundred thousand strong, of the old stamp of the Revolution. We have come up here—the delegation from Massachusetts—from the ground where on Bunker's Hill the Yankees of New England met the deadly fire of Britain. We have come from Concord, where was spilled the first blood of the Revolution; from Lexington, where the embattled farmers fired the shot that was heard around the world. We have come from Faneuil Hall, where spoke the patriots and sages and orators of the earliest and best days of American history, where our fathers heard propounded those doctrines and principles of liberty and human equality which found their enunciation and exposition in the constitution of Massachusetts, and by which, under judicial decision, human slavery was banished from the venerable soil of that ancient commonwealth, before the Colonies became a united People. We have come from the shadow of the old South church, where American liberty was baptized in the waters of religion. We hold the purpose firm and strong, as we have held it through the tedious struggle of years now gone by, to rescue, before we die, the holy ark of American liberty from the grasp of the Philistines. Yes, sir, whether in the majority, or without the majority of the American people, there we stand. Whether in victory or in defeat, there we stand, and, as said the Apostle, "having done all, still there we will stand, and because of our love and of our faith." The affection of our hearts and the judgment of our intellects bound our political fortunes to William Henry Seward, of New York, him who is the brightest and most shining light of this political generation, him who by the unanimous selection of the foes of our cause and our men, has for years been the determined standard-bearer of liberty—William H. Seward—whether in the legislature of his native state of New York, whether as governor of that imperial commonwealth, or whether as senator of the United States,

[1] See Memoir, *ante* page 78.

or as a tribune of the people, ever faithful, ever true. In the thickest and hottest of every battle, there waved the white plume of the gallant lead New York. And by no hand of Massachusetts was it for him to be str down. Dearly as we love triumph, we are used to momentary defeat becaus know we are right; and whatever storms assail our ship, before whatever she may reel and quake, we know that if the bark sinks it is but to another We know that this cause of ours is bound to triumph, and that the Amer people will, one day, be convinced, if not in 1860, that the path of duty patriotism leads in the direction of the republican cause. It was not fo to strike down William Henry Seward, of New York. But, as we love the c and as we respect our own convictions, and as we mean to be faithful to the organization on earth which is in the van of the cause of freedom, so do we, entire fidelity of heart, with entire concurrence of judgment, with the firmest most fixed purpose of our will, adopt the opinion of the majority of this conven

Carl Schurz, of Wisconsin:

I am commissioned by the delegation of Wisconsin to second the motion by the distinguished gentleman from New York. The delegates of Wisc were directed to cast their votes unanimously for William H. Seward, and unnecessary to say that the instructions we received added but solemn obligat of our constitutents to the spontaneous impulses of our hearts. It would be less to say anything in praise of Mr. Seward. His claims stand recorded i annals of the country, and they are reported in the hearts of the people. needs no eulogy here, and my vote can add nothing to so powerful a testim We went for him because we considered him the foremost among the best, to whatever may be said in his praise I will add but one thing. I now speaking in the spirit of Mr. Seward, when I say that his ambition will be sati with the success of the cause which was the dream of his youth, and to whic has devoted all the days of his manhood—even if the name of Wm. H. Se should remain in history an instance of the highest merit uncrowned with highest honor. We stood by Mr. Seward to the last, and we stand by him in supporting Mr. Lincoln. With the platform we adopted yesterday, and the candidate who so fairly represents it, as Mr. Lincoln does, we defy all passion and prejudice that may be enforced against us by our opponents. defy the whole slave power and the whole vassalage of hell. Aye, and we the "Little Giant" himself. Again, I say we stand by Mr. Seward as we before—for we know that he will be at the head of our column, joining in battle-cry that joins us now, "Lincoln and victory."

Austin Blair, of Michigan:

Like my friend who has just taken his seat, the state of Michigan, from to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has not to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she put me forward to say that, at your behests here to-day, she lays down her best loved candidate to take up yours, with some bleeding of the heart, with quivering in the veins; but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will su for she knows that his fame is a portion of the history of the American Un it will be written and read and beloved long after the temporary excitemen this day has passed away, and when presidents are themselves forgotten in the vion which comes over all temporal things. We stand by him still. We followed him with a single eye and with unwavering faith in times past. marshal now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battl Abraham Lincoln of Illinois, and to conquer; for mark you, what has happe to-day will happen in November next—Lincoln will be elected with just su shout as has been given to-day in this vast assemblage.

O. H. Browning, of Illinois:

On behalf of the Illinois delegation I have been requested to make some pr response to the speeches that we have heard from our friends of the other st

Illinois ought hardly on this occasion to be expected to make a speech, or called upon to do so. I desire to say, gentlemen of the convention, that in the contest through which we have just passed, we have been actuated by no feeling of hostility to the illustrious statesman from New York, who was in competition with our own loved and gallant son. No republican who has a love of freedom in his heart, and who has marked the course of Gov. Seward, of New York, in the councils of our nation, who has witnessed the many occasions upon which he has risen to the very hight of moral sublimity in his conflicts with the enemies of free institutions; no heart that has the love of freedom in it and has witnessed these great conflicts of his, can do otherwise than venerate his name. On this occasion I desire to say, only, that the hearts of the Illinois delegation are to-day filled with emotions of gratification for which they have no utterance. We are not more overcome by the triumph of our noble Lincoln, loving him as we do, knowing the purity of his past life, the integrity of his character, and devotion to the principles of our party, and the gallantry with which we will be conducted through this contest, than we are by the magnanimity of our friends of the great and glorious state of New York, in moving to make this nomination unanimous.

JOHN D. BALDWIN, Worcester, Massachusetts:

I went to the Chicago convention feeling it my duty to do everything in my power to secure the nomination of Mr. Seward. This was required by the preferences of those I represented and by my own sentiments. It is now unnecessary to go into an extended eulogy of Mr. Seward. He is one of the great men of the age, whose fame is as wide as the civilized world. He is thought of in Europe as we think of him here. One evening, after Charles Sumner's return from Europe, at a supper where I heard him relate many incidents connected with his stay in Europe, Mr. Sumner spoke of Wm. E. Gladstone, the coming man in Great Britain, as "the most accomplished orator that speaks in the English language, and gave the company Mr. Gladstone's opinion of Mr. Seward. It was as follows: "Mr. Seward's argument in the Freeman case is the greatest forensic effort in the English language." An English gentleman present replied: "The greatest? Mr. Gladstone, you forget Erskine." "No," replied Mr. Gladstone, "I do not forget Mr. Erskine; Mr. Seward's argument is the greatest forensic effort in the language." And he is regarded abroad, as well as at home, as one of the most philosophic and profound statesmen living. Mr. Seward could not be made greater by the presidency, and he can feel, as we do, that it is better to be William H. Seward than to be president.

THE REPUBLICAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE: NEW YORK, May 19, 1860.

To Hon. William H. Seward—Dear Sir—We address you with feelings of regret that cannot be sufficiently expressed. The result of the Chicago convention has been more than a surprise to the republicans of New York. That you, who have been the earliest defender of republican principles—the acknowledged head and leader of the party—who have given direction to its movements, and form and substance to its acts—that you should have been put aside upon the narrow ground of expediency, we can hardly realize or believe. Whatever the decision of this, or a hundred other conventions, we recognize in you the real leader of the republican party; and the citizens of every state and of all creeds and parties, and the history of our country will confirm this judgment.

As that leader—as one to whom we shall hereafter as in times past look for counsel and direction, the republicans of this city desire, that you should be with them at the first public meeting which will be held. Your presence will at least alleviate their disappointment, and revive their exertions; and will also enable them again to evidence their undiminished confidence and attachment, and their gratitude for all that you have done for the welfare of our country and the preservation of her liberties.

CHARLES C. NOTT, WILLIAM H. BULL, A. J. WILLIAMSON, C. S. SPENCER,
F. W. SHEPHERD, Committee, &c.

RECEPTION SPEECHES.

BOSTON—GOVERNOR BANKS:

I know it is a custom of the people of Boston to w
and enthusiastic words of friendship, every man of na
the honor to visit this our loved city. Here, at least,
fear; and from whatever quarter of the world a man sh
his people in his day or way, we can afford, and we will
am glad to say, fellow citizens, that, like other human be
and among others there is none that finds a warmer
people of the old Bay state than the renowned statesma

Though not so well known to us personally as he shou
and as citizens of Massachusetts, for many long years we
directing the interests of the Empire state and developi
that portion of the continent; and, enjoying, as we ha
metropolis of New England and of the commonwealth, t
his industry, his wisdom, and his great and far-reaching
of the nation, I know you will welcome him as he dese
will speak for him and for the people of the commonw
presented him to you.

Governor SEWARD—Our friends have met here at a f
know what hospitality is due to you—that you come a
travel at the warmest season of the year—and we canno
from you: but a little is required in obedience to that
the people of this commonwealth entertain for you; a
zens would grieve if we were to allow you to pass throu
a word of welcome, without a cheer that should come f
ple of Massachusetts.

Fellow citizens, I present to you the Honorable W
United States senate, respected and loved by the people

LANSING, Mich.—J. W. LONGYEAR, Esq.:

I have been appointed by a large and enthusiastic
fellow citizens, to discharge the honorable and agreea
you their affectionate esteem, and their heartfelt welcon
it is here upon the eve of the decision, a final decision
of the most important political contests by which the re
tated, that we welcome you among us for your count
your advice. It is here amidst a population emigrated
state, here amidst institutions of government copied
which you live, we welcome you; and here, noble sena
amidst your ardent admirers, who were second to none
to see you the standard-bearer in this decisive contest, t
we thrice welcome you, sir, for the reason that while t
convention assembled, saw fit, in their wisdom, to ch
found deserting your post of duty, but like the true soldi
your duty with knapsack and bayonet, if required, alt
highest grade of office.

This contest in which so ferocious a war is now ragin
would urge, of one section of the republic against the
against another, but that of free institutions, free soil, fr
against slavery and its concomitant evils; not a war ag
tions of the states as they now exist, but against the
curse of African slavery into territory now free! It i
against slavery, and it is owing to the patriotic manner i

[1] See *ante* page 81.

your life, your fortune, and your sacred honor, to the support of the former, that you now owe this enthusiastic reception.

To you, sentiments expressed by yourself, in years gone by, to one of the nation's most honored sons, now gone to his final rest, upon an occasion similar to this, may, in these, your riper years, be appropriately applied to yourself: "Such honors frequently attend public functionaries, and such a one may sometimes find it difficult to determine how much of the homage he receives is paid to his own worth, how much proceeds from the habitual reverence of good republican citizens to constitute elective authority, and how much from the spirit of venal adulation.

"You, sir, labor under no such embarrassment. The office you hold, though honorable, is purely legislative. You are not in a position, or in nomination for a position, in which you can have any patronage to bestow, and yet your hands are uplifted, and your exertions bestowed to secure blessings on your country.

"The homage paid you, dear sir, is sincere, for it has its sources in the just sentiments and irrepressible affections of a free people, their love of truth, their admiration of wisdom, their reverence for virtue, and their gratitude for beneficence."

The praises we bestow are not of a purely partisan nature. Men of all parties come here to see and hear you, and that with the profoundest respect as one of the great statesmen of the age; and "the praises we bestow are already echoed back to us by voices which come rich and full across the Atlantic, hailing you as the indefatigable champion of humanity."

MADISON, WIS.,—CHAUNCEY ABBOTT, Esq.:[1]

In behalf of the citizens of Madison, I welcome you, sir, to our midst; and it is with more satisfaction that I do so, inasmuch as I feel the assurance which I convey to you, that it is not merely a formal, but a most hearty and cordial welcome, which general public sentiment extends to you. However flattering any personal preferences or partialities may be, we must still feel that the general and enthusiastic welcome which the people award to you, arises from a sentiment that you are engaged in the great cause of constitutional and political liberty, so near and dear to the people of this state, and of this region. There is a common sentiment and feeling that the great country lying northwest of the Ohio, consecrated to liberty and free institutions, and free government, by the ordinance of 1787, established by the founder of the government, has been preserved to freedom, in a great measure, by the earnest, zealous, able, efforts put forth by you. It is for this reason that the people are so glad to welcome you among them; hoping that you may receive such assurances of their confidence and support as may enable you hereafter to go forth in association with your fellows, to carry out your peaceful and successful issues in the cause of constitutional freedom and free government, in which cause we pledge you our support and our aid. Sir, you are most welcome among us. The governor of the state will now speak in behalf of the people of the state generally.

GOV. RANDALL:

You need, sir, no formal introduction to the people of Wisconsin. The gathering throngs that have met you on your way hither, are evidences to you how deeply your name and deeds are engraven on the hearts of this people. We are a young state—a state but twelve years of age—a state containing eight hundred thousand inhabitants—a state marvelous in its prosperity, great in its resources, agricultural, mineral and commercial. On its west it has a great commercial highway, another on its east. Iron roads, binding together its rich. growing cities, traverse all its length and breadth. The farms of the people are like gardens, and the cities are set like bright jewels in the crown of their prosperity.

We have grown strong and flourished under the tree of liberty planted here by Virginia. Wisconsin is the daughter of Virginia, and the child has not forgotten the early taught lessons of the parent. There shall be no slavery or involuntary

[1] See *ante*, page 90.

servitude here forever. To-day the light of other days is around our people; the light of the days of Madison and Jefferson; and we have looked upon you as one of those who have stood forward in maintaining constitutional law and correct principle. You have done more than most men in public life. You have given a moral tone to the politics of the country. Going into the senate all alone, and standing there alone, feeling that

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just,"

You have given to politics a moral tone, and directed the intellect of this great people.

You have done more than most men have, to correct and manufacture and tame public sentiment within correct limits. In all the great measures of public policy for the benefit of the great west, your thoughts and words have been foremost in their advocacy. You have done much in favor of giving farms to the free settlers here, and whenever measures for the benefit of our commercial interest have been pending, your voice and vote have been given for them.

We feel, therefore, to you a debt of gratitude under these considerations. You were the first choice of the people of Wisconsin, as their candidate for the presidency of the United States. Yielding to the will of the national convention that met at Chicago, while we abated not one jot or tittle in our affection for you, Lincoln became, by the action of the convention, its first choice. We do battle to-day for him, and are proud to know that you stand in the forefront of that battle, and that we follow so illustrious a leader. He is our Moses, and you are our great High Priest, holding up his right hand, while the fight is going on.

Again, sir, in behalf of the free people, I welcome you to Wisconsin and its capital.

SAINT PAUL, MINN.,—JUDGE GOODRICH:[1]

GENTLEMEN—WIDE-AWAKES—FELLOW CITIZENS: The act of presenting to you the illustrious patriot and statesman who has ever occupied the highest niche in the temple of your affections—the man upon whom the eye of the nation has long been hopefully and anxiously fixed—the man

"Whose control has been felt,
Even in our nation's destiny;
Whose name adorns and dignifies the scroll
Whose leaves contain your country's history."

The man to whose form and features the artist of our day is eager to give immortality, is among the most pleasing incidents of my life. This vast concourse shall dissolve from the face of the earth; the daguerreian impression shall fade away; the photograph shall vanish; the bronze shall corrode and become as dross; and the marble that shall symbolize the man shall crumble to dust beneath the all-conquering hand of time that shall be lifted up during the reign of that glorious immortality which awaits his deeds; the man that is revered by the great and good of all parties—by the north and the south, the east and the west—by the soldier in his camp—the peasant in his cot—the plowman in his field—the mechanic in his shop—the merchant and banker who whiten the bosom of every sea beneath the sun with the rich sails of our commerce, by "they who go down to the sea in great ships," the stern warrior clad in mail, and the sage in the halls of the national councils.

I have traversed our state, I have looked abroad, I *know* that

"Throughout the land, o'er vale, o'er hill,
Are faces that attest the same,
That kindle like a fire new stirred,
At the sound of SEWARD's name."

Lastingly exalted is his fame, wherever eminent public service, unbending integrity, undying devotion to a righteous cause, transcendent genius, lofty deeds and high moral daring shall cause a thrill, or challenge the admiration of the human heart, there will the name of WILLIAM H. SEWARD be held up to high and noble commendation. Generations yet unborn shall rise up and swell the trumpet of his

1 See *ante*, page 94.

fame, while envy, and jealousy, and blind partisan bigotry, and partisan domination shall stand overwhelmed and blinded amid the transcendent effulgence that shall emanate from the pages of that history wherein is weighed the actions of men at the gates of eternity.

[Turning to Governor Seward, he said :]

HONORED SIR: In the name and on behalf of the freemen of Minnesota, I bid you welcome—welcome to our rising city, our infant state—our homes, our altars, and our fires.

FELLOW CITIZENS: Governor Seward, of New York, who has received at the hands of a grateful people, who have thronged the waysides to honor him as he journeyed hither, one continued ovation from his own "sweet Auburn," along the shores of the great lakes to the falls of St. Anthony, in the language of Burke I can truly say that the people have everywhere "leaped upon him like children upon a long absent father," now stands before you.

Hon. JOHN W. NORTH:

Fellow Citizens: We have met to-day to listen to a statesman who has long held a high place in the affections of our people; as well for his services to our territory and state, as for his lifelong devotion to the service of our common country; one who, by the united voice of friends and opponents, has been classed at the head of our living statesmen.

There is nothing remarkable in the homage that is paid to power, or in the empty praise that follows the rising fortunes of the mere politician. But when the people—unmoved by other considerations than those of genuine esteem and profound gratitude for noble services—come forth, as on the present occasion, in unprecedented numbers, to testify their appreciation of political integrity, profound statesmanship, and genuine manhood, it may well be marked as an exponent of the public virtue, and a guaranty that such qualities will continue to be sought for in our public servants. It teaches, also, that there are sublimer heights than those of official position or the chair of state—more enduring glory than a term of office or the brief prerogatives of power.

When profligate statesmen were framing mischief by law, and setting at defiance every principle of morality in the wild frenzy of partisan legislation, there was one to remind them that there was a "*higher law*" than the enactments of men, and which could not be thwarted or evaded by all their arts. When the body politic was convulsed by a disease too deep to be discovered by the political quacks who are ever administering anodynes and saving the Union, there was one who could discern the real sources of evil, and, from the serene heights of political philosophy, inform bewildered politicians that this was "no ephemeral struggle." caused by a few fanatics, but "*an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces*," and which could not be terminated until our country became wholly slave territory or wholly free.

And now, when the spirit of slavery has seized the reins of government, controlled its legislation, grasped free territory, and degraded the judiciary so low as to teach the inhuman doctrine that one portion of the people "have no rights" that the other portion "are bound to respect," there is one to tell them the simple but sublime truth that "the whole race suffers when injustice is done to the humblest and most despised of its members."

These, fellow citizens, are noble sentiments, and worthy of the statesman of your choice—a statesman whose patriotism is not bounded by sectional lines of mountains and rivers, nor his philanthropy by nationality—a friend of the oppressed of every land—a friend alike of the north and of the south, of the east and of the west, of the older states and the infant territories. I have the honor to introduce to you the honorable William H. Seward, of New York.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,—JOHN HUTCHINSON, Esq.:

Senator Seward: In behalf of the citizens of Minneapolis, of Hennepin county, and this northwestern state, I take pleasure in extending to you a heartfelt welcome.

We welcome you as the friend of freedom; we welcome you as the expounder and bold advocate of constitutional rights, and the true embodiment of republican principles. It is with unfeigned joy that we look upon you, for the first time, to-day, on our own soil. We are not unmindful, sir, of the fact that much of your life has been devoted to the good of your country, and that in the American senate you have ever been foremost in cementing into one common brotherhood this glorious confederacy, ever toiling assiduously for the supremacy of right and for our national prosperity, ever supporting those measures founded in justice, truth and equality, and ever fearlessly opposing tyranny, oppression and wrong.

And while the republicans of Minnesota were foremost, in the convention at Chicago, in presenting you as our standard-bearer, yet they were among the first to acquiesce and show their fidelity to principle by their firm and enthusiastic support of the present nominee. Asking you to take one hasty glance at our unequaled products and vast resources, I again bid you welcome, and have the honor, fellow citizens, to present to you the first living American statesman and senator, WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

DUBUQUE, IOWA,—W. B. ALLISON, Esq.:[1]

Senator Seward: In the name and on behalf of the republicans of the state of Iowa, on behalf of the thousands now present, and especially on behalf of the people of this city, whom you have honored by coming among us, I convey to you a cordial, sincere and heartfelt welcome, and an assurance of the exalted sense which we entertain of your character and public services.

The highest moral and intellectual qualities, steadily and triumphantly devoted to the noblest purposes, always command the respect and admiration of an enlightened and Christian people. Though few of the vast multitude now present have ever before met you face to face, yet all have long since learned to admire the eloquent zeal with which you have, for a series of years, maintained that our government was formed, *in part*, to foster and protect free labor, and to discourage and prohibit, whenever it has the power, slave labor. We all remember with what patriotic devotion you have ever opposed the federal recognition of human bondage, and with what power and eloquence you have battled against the apologists for and supporters of this fivefold barbarism. We remember your gallant but unavailing services in the great contest of 1854, in opposition to the ruthless hands that tore from the statute books the Missouri restriction, which had so long stood as a wall against the encroachments of human servitude.

Iowa was the first sovereign state that indorsed your efforts, and at the ballot box placed the seal of condemnation upon that act of perjury; and up to this hour has stood true to the position then taken.

We remember your eloquent appeals in behalf of the citizens of Kansas in the hour of need and of peril. We remember, also, that your voice and your vote in the senate have ever been in favor of a policy tending to build up and unfold the infant settlements in our expansive west. Especially do we remember your aid in securing to our own state the munificent land grants which will advance us at least a *decade* in all that develops our material progress. We remember that you have ever aided in the improvement of our own western rivers and harbors—the great natural highways by which we are enabled cheaply to reach the markets of the east. We remember that the cause of domestic industry, of education, of whatever, in short, is calculated to render us a prosperous, united and happy people, has found in you a watchful and efficient advocate.

With all these memories clustering about us and clinging to us, the enthusiasm with which we to-day greet you is but the spontaneous effusion of grateful and patriotic hearts. We recognize you as once the forerunner and now the champion of that million army which marches under the broad banner of republicanism. It is eminently fitting that the people of one sovereign state should assemble to hear and interchange sentiments with the distinguished men of other sovereign states.

1 See *ante*, page 96.

We are bound together by a thousand ties of interest, of sympathy, of affection and of duty. We have one common origin, one common constitution, one common country, and one common destiny. Especially is it fitting, then, at this hour of general distrust and alarm, that we should inquire "where we are, and whither we are tending."

It has been said the noblest homage a freeman can give, or a freeman receive, is the homage of hearts; that homage the thousand hearts that encircle you tender to you to-day, not the homage due a senator alone, but due the distinguished scholar and statesman whose *fame* is commensurate with the civilized world, and whose name is sacred to the oppressed everywhere. I do but echo the language of the throng that has crowded around you when I say again that to you we extend a cordial and friendly greeting.

SAINT JOSEPH, MO.,—T. J. BOYNTON, Esq.:[1]

Senator SEWARD: I have been delegated by the republicans of St. Joseph to bid you, in their name, and in the name of all our citizens, welcome to our city. We greet you as the foremost man of this age—as the man whose philosophical statesmanship has won for him a name which is as broad as the globe, and which will live forever—as the man whose views are more consonant with that spirit of progress which is abroad in the world than the views of any other man of any country. We greet you as the citizen of our country, the broad philanthropy of whose teachings has done most to educate that spirit of progress and give it the true direction.

In one of your late speeches, you have predicted that the time is not distant when the Empire State and the Keystone State and the Old Dominion of the country will lie here in the Mississippi valley. This is a subject in which we, immediately, of the Missouri valley, are vitally interested. As selfish men, we have peculiar reason to greet you cordially; for when those measures which are matters of life or death for us have been deserted by those who should have been their proper and peculiar advocates, they have been championed by yourself. Some of us are republicans, but we are all business men; and we watch the fate, in congress, of those measures for the development of the west on which depends the prosperity or the decline of our city with the most anxious solicitude. We have ever found you our foremost, our most steadfast friend. But I will not weary you, nor those who are waiting to hear you. Once again, as republicans, as citizens of St. Joseph and of the great West, we bid you welcome.

LEAVENWORTH, Kansas,—A. CARTER WILDER, Esq.:[2]

Sir: I am charged with the very honorable and grateful duty of expressing to you the profound regard and affectionate esteem of my fellow citizens assembled before you; and to extend to you a most cordial welcome to this metropolis of Kansas. We have watched, with pride and gratification, the demonstrations of respect and kindness which have attended every step of your journey from Auburn to Leavenworth. Such sincere homage is due to your character and illustrious public services; and no people have more reason to manifest their gratitude for your fidelity and friendship than the free people of Kansas.

Though holding a seat in the United States senate from the state of New York, Kansas and the Pacific claim you as *their* senator and statesman. For when you retire, as perhaps you will do on the fourth of March next, from the place to which the empire state deputed you as her senator, and when one who reads the record of your speeches and your votes is asked what state did the occupant of that vacant chair represent, he will be forced to answer, I cannot tell!

Judging from your acts, it would seem that, whosoever were weak and lowly, whosoever brought peril and reproach upon their advocate, whosoever could do nothing in return for countenance and support rendered, they were the persons whom you put yourself forward to represent and defend. You took upon yourself the burdens which others rejected, and braved the unpopularity by which

[1] See *ante* page 98. [2] See *ante* page 100.

others were dismayed. And thus the heart of the American people is with the man who was always in advance of their opinions, always seeing clear at the *hour* the truth which was to dawn upon their vision after it had been derided for many days; always combating boldly for the right, which had not yet become respected and acknowledged.

LAWRENCE, Kansas,—Mayor DEITZLER:[1]

WILLIAM H. SEWARD: The people of Lawrence, through a committee of citizens, and through their municipal authorities, have requested me to extend to you, and to the ladies and gentlemen constituting your party, a hearty welcome to the hospitalities of their city, and to assure you that they appreciate highly the distinguished compliment paid them, in being thus favored with an opportunity of seeing, hearing, and greeting the great republican chief whose name and fame are known and honored throughout the civilized world.

As we stand here, to-day, upon the ground where the Kansas rebellion, so-called, had its origin, and against which were directed, most frequently and persistently, the fierce and violent assaults of the myrmidons of slavery, and look back upon those scenes of oppression and wrong, and feel that we have in our midst the great and good man who, by his eloquent appeals and timely remonstrance, roused the great freedom-loving heart of the north to generous sympathy and noble deeds in our behalf, the occasion becomes one of deep and solemn interest.

In contemplating your distinguished and self-sacrificing services in defense of our cause—services which have enshrined the name of William H. Seward in the hearts of the freemen of Kansas—we are moved, by every sentiment of manly gratitude, and by every feeling of devotion to *true* greatness and *real* worth, to pray, with earnestness, God bless, and preserve for a long life of usefulness to the world, the purest patriot and the greatest statesman of the age.

Again we welcome you to the *heart* of "the Saratoga of Freedom."

Governor ROBINSON:[1]

The freemen of Kansas will not permit that Lawrence alone shall have the honor of bidding you welcome to the state of their adoption. Hence are they here in person, from every county and hamlet, and they bid me give words to their welcome, so far as hearts, throbbing with admiration and love, have utterance.

Owing to the recent settlement of our territory, the rudeness of our homes, the unparalleled obstacles thrown in the way of our progress, and the unprecedented drouth and consequent distress among our people, we cannot hope to receive you with that pomp and circumstance which have marked your progress hither; but we bring, what other states have not to give—hearts overflowing with gratitude and respect due to the deliverer of a people from present and impending evil.

In the days of our political thraldom, when we were mocked with the promise of sovereignty, that we might be enslaved; when our people were persecuted, defrauded, plundered and murdered, that they might be driven to despair and crushed out; then it was that you, our honored guest, stood by us, denounced the tyranny, and interpreted the "handwriting upon the wall" in the ears of the whole nation, until the knees of the tyrant trembled with fear, and his heel was removed from the necks of our people.

The contest which has waged in this country since Kansas was opened to settlement, and before, is not local, but general; is not one of arms, but of ideas. It is true that there has been an occasional collision of arms in Kansas, and a bloody hand struck down one of the noblest and most gifted members of the senate; but here, our weapons of war are exchanged for husbandry—and, like truth crushed to earth, Charles Sumner has risen, and is found in the thickest of the conflict.

With this exception, this warfare has been one of ideas, of mind, of intellect, not carnal, but spiritual; and it is in such a conflict we recognize William H. Seward as commander-in-chief of freedom's host, and as such we welcome him to our

[1] See *ante* page 101.

hearts and homes. His distinguished staff we also welcome as most worthy aids to such a general in such a cause.

In 1854, on the floor of the senate of the United States, you accepted the challenge of the slave power in these memorable words: "Come on, then, gentlemen of the slave states; since there is no escaping your challenge, I accept it in behalf of freedom. We will engage in competition for the virgin soil of Kansas, and God give the victory to the side that is stronger in numbers as it is in right."

Six years have elapsed, and to-day we present you Kansas free, to grace your triumph, with a constitution adopted by her people, without a stain of slavery to mar its beauty.

The times are most auspicious. The clouds that have so long darkened our political horizon are fast dispersing southward, and victory is marching upon victory throughout the entire north. With propriety, therefore, may we greet you on this occasion, as a conquering hero, fresh from the field of battle. God grant these triumphs may extend till they shall place the honest statesman of Illinois in the seat of power, with our guest at his right hand, when the conflict between freedom and the federal power shall be effectually and forever repressed.

Again, I welcome you to Kansas. In behalf of the people of whatever party, I welcome you as a statesman whom all Christendom is proud to honor. In behalf of those who battled for freedom on the soil of Kansas, I welcome you as their champion and defender. And in behalf of *all* the people, of whatever age, condition or sex, I welcome you as their deliverer from despotic rule and the blighting curse of human slavery.

CHICAGO,—JOHN WENTWORTH, Mayor:[1]

Senator SEWARD: In welcoming you to our city, I should do injustice to the sentiments of the friends of free labor did I not congratulate you on the fresh laurels you have acquired by the different speeches you have made on your western tour. They have placed the devotees of human liberty under additional obligations to you, and given them new proof that you had "rather be Right than be President." The truths, which you have uttered with so much eloquence and directness, will outlive the messages of presidents, and reproduce themselves at every attempt of avarice to make merchandise of Humanity. We consider ourselves under the greater obligations to you for the frankness and candor with which you have presented the sole issue of the day; since timid men, over-anxious for success, sometimes manifest a disposition to detract from the moral force of our certainly approaching victory by denying our faith and otherwise lowering our standard. It was our presidential candidate who uttered the words of prophetic truth, that these United States must eventually all be free or all be slave. Most heartily do we thank you for keeping this "irrepressible conflict" before the people in your travels; and never have you presented it with more persuasive accuracy than in your recent speeches. The laborers of this country must own themselves, and the least we can do to effect this object is, in the language of our presidential candidate, "to arrest the further spread of slavery, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction." Speeches like yours are the most effective weapons in the warfare for this extinction. We want no hostile incursions, servile insurrections, nor any illegal act of any kind. They will only retard the progress of the anti-slavery movement. All that is wanted is a corrected southern opinion, reformed legislation, a rightfully interpreted constitution, and that you, sir, shall remain in the senate to originate and advocate measures until this nation shall claim you from the service of the state of New York, and make you the successor of one whose proverbial honesty and published opinions made him the nearest to your own personality that the late convention could get, without depriving the country of your invaluable services in the senate.

[1] See *ante* page 108.

SPEECH ON INAUGURATION D

Mr. Seward's senatorial office expired with the third day of Mar delegation from the State of New York, several hundred in number, to witness Mr. Lincoln's inauguration, called upon Mr. Seward. respect and affection. After a few introductory remarks by James spoke as follows:

Friends, Fellow Citizens and Neighbors:—I am very unexpected demonstration of affection on the part of the New York. So many familiar faces, seen at this distance the circumstances which surround me, awaken memories should find it difficult to describe. It is just twelve years s and alone, to this Capital, to represent, in the councils of th from which you have come. This day closes that service of which now in retrospect seems so short, and yet it has part of the constitutional duration of this great empire. before you a voluntary citizen, but, God be thanked! a citi the state of New York—one of yourselves—your equal— responsibilities of a representative. My public acts throug me trying period, are all upon record in the journals and d is almost fearful to think that they are imperishable. L them, I will say and maintain here, and now, that I claim of good motives and honest intentions. Here in this pres delegation of the constituency I have served; and in th who is to be our common judge, I declare that there is record which I desire should be obliterated. Although a state only, I have been all the while conscious that I was the states—for the whole republic—and I am not ashan citizen of New York and ask him to say what I have negl to appeal to every section—to the east, to the west, to the equally—and to every state in every section, and to every to every human being, freeman or bondsman, to say wheth of mine, I have done him wrong. And in labors which de not claim, and trials which exacted some equanimity of tem Capital neither received nor given personal offense. I hav section to forgive. I know of no one who will utter a per me. I have done little good, indeed—far less than I ha been sustained and supported by the people of New York is unparalleled. I know why this is so. The people of N constant, and faithful to conscience, to truth, to liberty, to their God. They have thought that I endeavored to be lik their character well, and I know that in the new emerge is now entering upon, they will be equally faithful. I rel and their patriotism, as I do on the intelligence and patriotis of the United States. They will preserve the inestimable gious liberty which they have received from their heroic tration which you have come here to inaugurate comes int stances of embarrassment and peril; but I believe I kn purposes of the Chief Magistrate: I believe that, while h be also just to every state and every section, and every defend and protect the rights and interests, the peace an the states equally and alike, while he will practise the m from virtue, and the affection that arises from patriotism Under his guidance, and with the blessing of God, I belie dently expect, that an administration that is inaugurate and painful apprehensions, will close upon a reunited, res and happy republic. The state of New York, the greates the states, will lead all other states in the way of conciliati wisdom is always the path of peace, so I am sure that now way of conciliation is the way of wisdom.

INDEX TO VOLUME IV.

A.

PAGE.

Abbott, Chauncey, Speech, ... 90, 685
Adams, Charles Francis, ... 82, 93
Adams, John, ... 127, 175, 329, 373
Adams, John Quincy, ... 33, 90, 305, 391
Addresses and Orations, ... 121
Address, American Institute, ... 23, 144
of Mich. Agricultural College, 88
at Plymouth, ... 179
at Yale College, ... 160
Admission of Kansas, ... 117, 479–619
Advent of the Republican Party, ... 225
Aggressions of Slavery, ... 36
Agricultural College Bill, ... 63
Albany Bridge Case, ... 56
Albany Speeches, ... 35, 225
Allison, Wm. B., Speech, ... 96, 688
America, Destiny of, ... 121
American Independence, its True Basis, 144
American Institute, ... 23, 144
Amistad Case, The, ... 57
Andrew, Governor, Speech of, ... 681
APPENDIX, ... 679
Aristocracy Resisted, ... 325
Army Bill, The, ... 54, 535, 559
Army, A Standing, ... 87, 541
Astor House, Speech at, ... 644
Atchison, Reception and Speech, ... 103
Auburn Speeches, .. 35, 67, 114, 276, 422

B.

Baldwin, John D., Speech, ... 683
Ballots for President, Chicago, ... 77
Banks, Governor, Speech, ... 81, 684
Barbarism and Civilization, ... 615
Barbarous Laws, ... 512, 545
Biography of De Witt Clinton, ... 206
Blair, Austin, Speech, ... 682
Boston, Speech 82
Boynton, T. J., Speech, ... 98, 689
Broderick's Death, ... 70
Broderick and Douglas, ... 596
Brown, John, ... 68, 71, 358, 637
Browning, O. H., Speech, ... 682
Buffalo Speeches, ... 35, 111, 241

C.

Calhoun, John C., ... 478
California, Admission of, ... 17, 625
Campaign Speeches, ... 84, 225

PAGE.

Cass, General, ... 616
Celebration of Victory, ... 115
Chicago Convention, ... 76, 681
Platform, ... 679
Speeches, ... 108, 348
Chillicothe Speech, ... 97
Clay, Henry, ... 16, 448, 596, 627
Clayton, John M., ... 26, 44
Clergymen's Petition, ... 29
Cleveland Speeches, ... 110, 384, 430
Clinton, De Witt, George and James, . 206
Columbus Oration, ... 23, 121
Compensation of Members of Congress, 31
Compromises, 16, 24, 438, 448, 514, 572
Compromise and Calhoun, ... 478
Compromises and Concessions, ... 602
Compromise and the Constitution, 478, 621
Compromises and Crittenden, 516, 534, 572
Compromises, Distrust of, ... 610
Compromise, The Day for, ... 519
Compromise of 1850, ... 570, 625
Compromises Ended, ... 478, 514
Compromises and Henry Clay, ...448, 627
Compromise, The Lecompton-English, . 604
Compromise, The Missouri, 438, 579, 623
Compromise and Peace 610
Compromise and Secession, ... 509
Compromises and the Union, ... 516
Compromises and Webster, ... 449, 627
Conflict, Irrepressible, 56, 279, 389, 399, 412, 568, 619
Constitution Interpreted, The, ... 329, 553
Consular Appointments, ... 58
Convention, Baltimore, ...20, 74
Charleston, ... 74
Chicago, ... 76
Cincinnati, ... 42
Constitutional, ... 667
Philadelphia, ... 42
Pittsburgh, ... 41
Court, The Supreme, ... 49
Crisis, Impending, Helper's, ... 70, 635
Crittenden, John J., ... 516, 534, 572
Cuba Question, The, ... 57, 61

D.

Death of Broderick, ... 70
Decadence of Liberty, ... 303, 629
Defeat of Whig Party, ... 22
Deitzler, Mayor, Speech, ... 101, 690
Democratic Element, The, ... 319, 459

PAGE.
Demoralization, ... 303, 355, 425
Destiny of America,..... 121
Minnesota, ... 347
the West,..... 319, 330, 368
Detroit Speeches,..... 43, 84, 253, 303
Development of America,..... 160
Disunion and Secession, 344, 410, 418, 421, 429, 479, 644, 651, 670
Douglas, Broderick and Stuart,..... 596
Dred Scott Case,..... 47, 585
Dubuque Speeches, ... 96, 368
Duties on Railroad Iron,..... 50

E.

Elections in 1852, ... 21
1856, ... 43
1858, ... 56
1859, ... 69
1860, ... 73, 114, 422
Election, The Night before,..... 422
Emigrant Aid Societies,..... 490
English Bill, The,..... 53, 604
Equality, Political, ... 319, 330, 368, 397
Equal Rights,..... 337
European Tour,..... 63
Evarts, William M., Speech, ... 681

F.

Famine in Kansas,..... 110, 388
Fanaticism, The Charge of, ... 559
Fathers of the Republic, Policy,..... 397
Federalist, The, quoted,..... 655
Field, Cyrus W.,..... 45
Fillibusters' Schemes,..... 55
Fillmore, Millard,..... 19
Francis, John W.,..... 414
Fraud of Lecompton—English,..... 604
Freedom, Struggle for, 1850,..... 15
saved by Kansas,..... 385
and Public Faith, ... 433
in Kansas, ... 574
Free Schools, ... 411, 427
Free Speech, ... 97, 106, 341, 381, 544
Fugitive Slave Bill,..... 32
Fulton, Robert,..... 374
Fusion Creed, The,..... 428
Future, The Past and the,..... 430
Future, Young Men and the,..... 384

G.

Goodrich, Aaron, Judge,..... 94, 686

H.

Hamilton, Alexander, ... 127, 661
Harper's Ferry Captured,..... 68
Helper's Book, ... 70, 635
Henry, Patrick, ... 140, 376
Higher Law, The,..... 126, 464
Homestead Bill, The,..... 29, 31, 58

I.

PAGE.
Illinois, Visit to,..... 107
Impending Crisis, Helper's,..... 70, 635
Impeachment of President,..... 479, 503
Indiana Senators,..... 57, 59
Intellectual Development of the People, 160
Interpretation of the Constitution,... 329
Iowa, Speeches in,..... 96, 368
Irrepressible Conflict,.. 56, 289, 389, 399, 412, 619
Isothermal Theory, The,..... 599

J.

Jefferson, Thomas, 374, 376, 435, 661, 668
Jefferson on Emancipation,..... 635
Jefferson on the Union,..... 653

K.

Kalamazoo Speech,..... 89
Kane, Judge,..... 36, 286
Kane, Thomas L., ... 54
Kansas, ... 281, 512, 618, 643
Admission of, 39, 117, 619, 643
Affairs,.. 37, 50, 57, 117, 433, 479
and the Army,..... 535
Elections,..... 496
Laws,..... 501, 512, 545
and the President, ... 481, 503
the Savior of Freedom,... 385, 673
Speeches in,..... 101, 103, 385
King, Rufus,..... 310, 375, 391, 414
Know Nothingism, ... 283

L.

Labor States and Capital States,..... 621
La Crosse Speech,..... 93, 409, 421
Lansing Speech, ... 85
Lawrence Speech, ... 101, 385
Laws, Bogus, ... 512, 545
Leavenworth Speech, ... 102
Lecompton Constitution, ... 51, 574
Lee, Gideon, Anecdote of,..... 515
Lemmon Case, The, ... 36
Letter approving Lincoln's Nomination, 79
on Nebraska Bill,..... 27, 432
to Republican Committee,..... 79
John Quincy Adams,..... 33
New York,..... 27, 79, 432
Liberty and the Pilgrims,..... 179
Lincoln, Abraham, . 77, 84, 107, 114, 346, 348, 362, 416, 663
Longyear, J. W., Speech,..... 86, 684

M.

Madison Speeches, ... 90, 319, 329
Mails, Overland, ... 61
Mail Steamers,..... 31
Mann, Horace,..... 358
Mason, Senator,..... 675
Massachusetts, Defense of,.. 486, 491, 644

PAGE.
MEMOIR, ... 13–118
Merchants of New York, Petition,... 670
Michigan, Speeches in,..... 84
Minnesota, Admission of,..... 54
Minnesota, Speeches in,..... 94, 330
Missouri Compromise,..... 25, 389, 433
Missouri, Speeches in, ... 97
Moral Development of the People,.... 160
More, Sir Thomas, ... 650
Mormons, The,..... 54

N.

National Divergence,..... 303
National Idea, The,..... 330, 348
Nebraska and Kansas,.. 24, 433, 464, 627
Negro Question, The, ... 369
New England Clergy, The,..... 29
New England Dinner Speech,... 117, 644
New Haven, Address at,..... 160
New Orleans and New York, ... 417
New York City, Early History of,.... 410
Defense of, ... 487
Letter to, ... 27, 79
Merchants' Petition, ... 670
Speeches,..... 64, 114, 410
Night Before Election, The,..... 422
Nominating Conventions,..... 21, 41, 74
Nomination of Lincoln, Mr. Seward on, 78
North, John W., Speech, ... 95, 687
Northwest, The,..... 94, 327, 331
Nye, General James W., ... 93, 103, 110

O.

ORATIONS AND ADDRESSES,..... 121
Oration at American Institute, ... 23, 144
Columbus, ... 23, 121
Plymouth, ... 36, 179
Yale College,..... 30, 160
Oregon, Admission of,..... 54
Overland Mails,..... 61

P.

Pacific Railroad,..... 24, 31, 57
Palace Garden Speech,..... 114
Past and the Future, The,..... 430
Patterson, George W.,..... 93
Phi Beta Kappa, Yale College,..... 160
Phillips, Wendell,..... . 36
Physical Development, ... 160
Pierce, Franklin, ... 20, 479, 481, 503
Pilgrims and Liberty,..... 179
Platforms 20, 42, 74, 76, 680
Plymouth Oration,..... 36, 179
Policy, Protective,..... 158
of the Fathers, ... 397
The Republican,..... 368
Political Equality, the National Idea,. 330
Parties of the Day,..... 276
Speeches,..... 223
Pomeroy, General,..... 103

PAGE.
Postage, Cheap,..... 63
President, The, Impeached,..... 503
Presidential Elections,..... 21, 43, 114
Presidential Nominations,.. 20, 42, 74, 76
Privileged Class, The,..... 225
Protective Policy,..... 158
Puritans, The,..... 179

R.

Randall, Governor, Speech,..... 90, 685
Reception at Atchison,..... 103
Auburn,..... 67
Boston,..... 81
Buffalo, ... 111
Chicago,..... 108
Chillicothe, ... 97
Cleveland, ... 110
Detroit, ... 84
Dubuque,..... 96
Kalamazoo, ... 89
La Crosse, ... 93
Lansing,..... 85
Lawrence, ... 101
Leavenworth, ... 102
Madison, ... 90
Milwaukee, ... 90
New York, ... 64, 66
St. Joseph,..... 98
St. Louis,..... 106
St. Paul,..... 94
Springfield, Ill.,..... 107
Reëlection of Mr. Seward, ... 33
Reformation Begun, ... 359
Republican Conventions, ... 41, 76
Republican Party, The, 41, 44, 76, 117,
225, 276, 287, 368, 410, 631
Republican Party Organized,..... 41
Republican Party Prophesied,..... 44
Robinson, Governor, Speech,.... 101, 690
Rochester, Speech at,..... 56, 289

S.

Saint Paul Speech,..... 94, 330
Saint Louis Speech,..... 106
Saint Joseph Speech, ... 98
Schurz, Carl, Speech of, ... 682
Scott, General, ... 20, 661
Secession, ... 421, 509, 644, 651, 670
(See Disunion and Union.)
Secretary of State, Appointed,..... 117
Seneca Falls Speech,..... 397
Slavery, .. 225, 241, 253, 303 to 397,
517, 527, 619, 651, 666, 673
Slave Trade, The,..... ..... 80, 409
Speaker, Contests,..... 15, 38, 70
SPEECHES, Albany, ... 35, 225
Atchison, ... 103
Auburn, . 67, 114, 115, 276, 422
Astor House, ... 644
Buffalo, ... 35, 241

PAGE.

SPEECHES, Chicago.. ..... 108, 348
Chillicothe, ... 97
Cleveland,..... 110, 384, 430
Chicago Convention, ... 680
Detroit,..... 43, 84, 253, 303
Dubuque, ... 96, 368
Kalamazoo, ... 89
La Crosse, ... 93, 409, 421
Lansing, ... 85
Lawrence,..... 101, 385
Leavenworth,..... 102
Madison, ... 90, 319, 329
New England Dinner,..... 644
New York,..... 64, 114, 410
Rochester,..... 56, 289
St. Joseph, ... 98
St Louis,..... 106
St. Paul, ... 94, 330
Seneca Falls, ... 397
Springfield, ... 107
Return from Europe, ... 64
Retiring from Senate, ... 692

SPEECHES. (Political.)
Constitution Interpreted,... 329
Contest and Crisis,..... 241
Democratic Element, ... 319
Disunion and Secession, ... 421
Dominant Class, ... 253
Equality Political, ... 330
Idea, The National, 330, 348, 368
Irrepressible Conflict,... 56, 289
Kansas Savior of Freedom, 385
National Divergence,..... 303
National Idea, The,.... 330, 348
Night before Election, The,. 422
One Idea, The,..... 368
Past and Future, The, ... 430
Political Equality,..... 330
Policy of the Fathers,..... 397
Political Parties,..... 276
Republican Party, The,.... 225
Republican Policy,..... 368
Republicans and Secession,. 410
Secession. N. E. Dinner,... 644
Trade in Slaves, ... 409
Young Men and the Future, 384

SPEECHES. (Senate.)
Admission of Kansas,. 479, 619
Army and Kansas,.... 535, 559
Country, the State of, 619, 651, 670
Freedom in Kansas,... 574, 604
Freedom and Public Faith, . 433
Kansas Affairs,..... 433 to 619
Merchants' Memorial, ... 670
Nebraska and Kansas,. 433, 464

SPEECHES. (Senate.) PAGE
Repeal of Mo. Compromise, 432
Second, on Nebraska,..... 464
State of the Country, ... 619
State of the Union,.... 651–670
Speeches to Mr. Seward, ... 684
Springfield Speech,..... 107
State of the Country, the Union, 619, 670
Sumner, Charles,..... 33, 40
Supreme Court, The,..... 49, 585, 595

T.

Tallmadge, James,..... 145
Tariff, The,..... 31, 46, 50, 80, 144, 154
Taylor, President,..... 16, 661
Telegraphs, Atlantic, Pacific,..... 45
Tompkins, Daniel D.,..... 218
Tour through Europe,..... 63
New England,..... 81
the West,..... 84
Trade in Slaves,..... 409
True Basis of Independence,..... 144
Trumbull, Senator, ... 356

U.

Union, The,.. 18, 344, 396, 441, 567, 619, 644, 651
(See Disunion and Secession.)
Union and Liberty,..... 638
Union, Loyalty to the, ... 639, 669
Union, The State of the,.... 619, 651, 670
Usurpations in Kansas,..... 512, 551
Utah, Affairs of,..... 54

V.

Valetudinarians and Minnesota,..... 334
Van Buren, Martin,..... 287, 305, 625
Vermont, Visit to,..... 81

W.

Walker, William,..... 55
War, Civil, deprecated,..... 652
Washburn, Israel, Jr.,..... 81
Washington, George,.....127, 373
Webster, Daniel,..... 16, 449, 627, 661
Wentworth, John, ... 108, 691
Western Speeches,..... 84, 253, 303
Whig Party,..... 15, 22
Wilder, A. C., ... 100, 689
Williamson, Passmore,..... 36
Wilmot Proviso, ... 16, 518
Wisconsin, Speeches in,..... 90, 319, 329

Y.

Yale College Oration..... 30, 160
Yale College, Degree conferred by,.. 30
Young Men and the Future,..... 384

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 025 484 069

MAR 30 '63

APR 16

Sta

In orde
please ret
not later t

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD AUXILIARY LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(650) 723-9201
salcirc@sulmail.stanford.edu
All books are subject to recall.
DATE DUE

OCT 2 2002
JUL 1 8 2002
JAN 2 6 2003
NOV 1 7 2002
FEB 2 5 2003
FEB 2 3 2003